

Historic, Archive Document

Do not assume content reflects current scientific knowledge, policies, or practices.

LEGISLATIVE HISTORY

Public Law 496--80th Congress

Chapter 229--2d Session

S. 2038

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Digest of Public Law 496	1
Index and Summary of History on S. 2038	2

DIGEST OF PUBLIC LAW 496

FOOT-AND-MOUTH DISEASE RESEARCH. Authorizes the Department to establish research laboratories, including acquisition of land, buildings, or facilities, and also the making of contracts, for research in the U. S. or elsewhere, on foot-and-mouth disease and other animal diseases which constitute a threat to the U. S. livestock industry. Prohibits introduction of live foot-and-mouth disease virus into the U. S. mainland except coastal islands separated therefrom by waters navigable for deep-water navigation and which shall not be connected with the mainland by a tunnel. Permits, however, such introduction under safeguards if there is an outbreak in this country. Authorizes employment of technical experts or scientists without regard to the Classification Act, (not exceeding 5 and at pay not over \$15,000.) Authorizes appropriations, and also authorizes use of funds otherwise available for control or eradication of such disease.

INDEX AND SUMMARY OF HISTORY ON S. 2038.

January 21, 1948	Senator Thye introduced S. 2038 and was referred to the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. Print of the bill as introduced.
January 22, 1948	Rep. Gillie introduced H. R. 5098 and was referred to the House Committee on Agriculture. Print of the bill as introduced. (Companion bill).
January 26, 1948	Hearings: House, H. R. 5098.
February 5, 1948	Hearings: Senate; S. 2038. Senate Committee ordered S. 2038 reported.
February 9, 1948	Senate Committee reported S. 2038 with an amendment. Senate Report 886. Print of the bill as reported.
February 24, 1948	Rep. Worley introduced H. R. 5539 which was referred to the House Committee on Agriculture. Print of the bill as introduced. (Similar bill).
February 25, 1948	Senate debated and passed S. 2038 with amendments.
February 26, 1948	S. 2038 was referred to the House Committee on Agriculture. Print of the bill as referred.
March 3, 1948	House Rules Committee reported H. Res. 491 for the consideration of H. R. 5098. House Report 1484. Print of the Resolution.
April 7, 1948	House began debate on H. R. 5098.
April 8, 1948	House debated and passed H. R. 5098 with amendments. Language of H. R. 5098 substituted for that of S. 2038. Extension of remarks of Rep. Worley.
April 14, 1948	Senate concurred in the House amendments.
April 24, 1948	Approved. Public Law 496.

80TH CONGRESS
2D SESSION

S. 2038

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

JANUARY 21, 1948

MR. THYE introduced the following bill; which was read twice and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry

A BILL

To enable the Secretary of Agriculture to conduct research on foot-and-mouth disease and other diseases of animals and to amend the Act of May 29, 1884 (23 Stat. 31), as amended, by adding another section.

1 *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representa-*
2 *tives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*
3 That the Act of May 29, 1884 (23 Stat. 31), as amended,
4 is hereby amended by adding thereto section 12.

5 "SEC. 12. The Secretary of Agriculture is authorized
6 to establish research laboratories, including the acquisition of
7 necessary land, buildings, or facilities, and also the making
8 of research contracts under the authority contained in sec-
9 tion 10 (a) of the Bankhead-Jones Act of 1935 as amended

1 by the Research and Marketing Act of 1946, for research
2 and study, in the United States or elsewhere, of foot-and-
3 mouth disease and other animal diseases which, in the
4 opinion of the Secretary, constitute a threat to the livestock
5 industry of the United States. To carry out the provisions
6 of this section, the Secretary is authorized to employ tech-
7 nical experts or scientists without regard to the Classifica-
8 tion Act: *Provided*, That the number so employed shall
9 not exceed five and that the maximum compensation for
10 each shall not exceed \$15,000 per annum. There is hereby
11 authorized to be appropriated such sums as Congress may
12 deem necessary; in addition, the Secretary is authorized
13 to utilize, in carrying out this section, funds otherwise avail-
14 able for the control or eradication of such diseases.”

A BILL

To enable the Secretary of Agriculture to conduct research on foot-and-mouth disease and other diseases of animals and to amend the Act of May 29, 1884 (23 Stat. 31), as amended, by adding another section.

By Mr. THYE

JANUARY 21, 1948

Read twice and referred to the Committee on
Agriculture and Forestry

80TH CONGRESS
2D SESSION

H. R. 5098

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

JANUARY 22, 1948

Mr. GILLIE introduced the following bill; which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture

A BILL

To enable the Secretary of Agriculture to conduct research on foot-and-mouth disease and other diseases of animals and to amend the Act of May 29, 1884 (23 Stat. 31), as amended, by adding another section.

1 *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representa-*
2 *tives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*
3 That the Act of May 29, 1884 (23 Stat. 31), as amended,
4 is hereby amended by adding a new section 12 reading as
5 follows:

6 “SEC. 12. The Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to
7 establish research laboratories, including the acquisition of
8 necessary land, buildings, or facilities, and also the making
9 of research contracts under the authority contained in section

1 10 (a) of the Bankhead-Jones Act of 1935, as amended by
2 the Research and Marketing Act of 1946, for research and
3 study, in the United States or elsewhere, of foot-and-mouth
4 disease and other animal diseases which in the opinion of the
5 Secretary constitute a threat to the livestock industry of the
6 United States. To carry out the provisions of this section,
7 the Secretary is authorized to employ technical experts or
8 scientists without regard to the Classification Act: *Provided*,
9 That the number so employed shall not exceed five and that
10 the maximum compensation for each shall not exceed \$15,000
11 per annum. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated
12 such sums as Congress may deem necessary; in addition, the
13 Secretary is authorized to utilize, in carrying out this section,
14 funds otherwise available for the control or eradication of
15 such diseases.”

80TH CONGRESS
2^D SESSION

H. R. 5098

A BILL

To enable the Secretary of Agriculture to conduct research on foot-and-mouth disease and other diseases of animals and to amend the Act of May 29, 1884 (23 Stat. 31), as amended, by adding another section.

By Mr. GILLIE

JANUARY 22, 1948

Referred to the Committee on Agriculture

9771527

ERADICATION OF FOOT-AND-MOUTH DISEASE

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE
LAW LIBRARY
LEGISLATIVE REPORTING

HEARINGS

BEFORE A

SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

EIGHTIETH CONGRESS

SECOND SESSION



JANUARY 26, 27, AND FEBRUARY 3 AND 4, 1948

Printed for the use of the Committee on Agriculture



UNITED STATES
GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE
WASHINGTON : 1948

SUBCOMMITTEE ON FOOT-AND-MOUTH DISEASE OF THE
COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE

GEORGE W. GILLIE, Indiana, *Chairman*

SID SIMPSON, Illinois

WALTER K. GRANGER, Utah

ERNEST K. BRAMBLETT, California

EUGENE WORLEY, Texas

CONTENTS

Statement of—	Page
Duckworth, Dr. Charles U., assistant director, California Department of Agriculture.....	160
Fisher, Hon. O. C., Representative in Congress from the State of Texas.....	43
Galloway, Dr. I. A., director and scientific secretary, British Foot-and-Mouth Research Committee.....	2
Hatfield, Hon. George J., State Senator from California.....	120
Lyle, Hon. John W., Representative in Congress from the State of Texas.....	151
Miller, Will J., secretary of Kansas State Livestock Association and State livestock sanitary commissioner.....	108
Mollin, F. E., executive secretary, National Livestock Association, Denver, Colo.....	89
Montague, Judge Joseph G., general attorney, Texas & Southwestern Cattle Raisers Association, Amarillo, Tex.....	101
Powers, Hon. Harold J., State Senator from California.....	139, 143
Sanders, J. T., legislative counsel, National Grange.....	97
Schoening, Dr. Harry W., Chief, Pathological Division, Bureau of Animal Industry.....	64, 73, 113
Shahan, Dr. M. S., veterinarian, Bureau of Animal Industry.....	78
Shope, Dr. R. E., Rockefeller Institute, Princeton University.....	45
Simms, Dr. B. T., Chief, Bureau of Animal Industry, Department of Agriculture.....	35
Traum, Dr. Jacob, professor of veterinary science, University of California.....	22

ERADICATION OF FOOT-AND-MOUTH DISEASE

MONDAY, JANUARY 26, 1948

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE,
SUBCOMMITTEE ON FOOT-AND-MOUTH DISEASE,
Washington, D. C.

The subcommittee convened at 10 a. m., the Honorable George W. Gillie, presiding.

Mr. GILLIE. The committee will come to order. The bill we are to consider this morning is H. R. 5098.

(The bill referred to is as follows:)

[H. R. 5098, 80th Cong., 2d sess.]

A BILL To enable the Secretary of Agriculture to conduct research on foot-and-mouth disease and other diseases of animals and to amend the Act of May 29, 1884 (23 Stat. 31), as amended, by adding another section

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Act of May 29, 1884 (23 Stat. 31), as amended, is hereby amended by adding a new section 12 reading as follows:

"S.c. 12. The Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to establish research laboratories, including the acquisition of necessary land, buildings, or facilities, and also the making of research contracts under the authority contained in section 10 (a) of the Bankhead-Jones Act of 1935, as amended by the Research and Marketing Act of 1946, for research and study, in the United States or elsewhere, of foot-and-mouth disease and other animal diseases which in the opinion of the Secretary constitute a threat to the livestock industry of the United States. To carry out the provisions of this section, the Secretary is authorized to employ technical experts or scientists without regard to the Classification Act: *Provided*, That the number so employed shall not exceed five and that the maximum compensation for each shall not exceed \$15,000 per annum. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as Congress may deem necessary; in addition, the Secretary is authorized to utilize, in carrying out this section, funds otherwise available for the control or eradication of such diseases."

Mr. GILLIE. This hearing has been called for the specific purpose of trying to find ways and means for the establishment of a research laboratory for the study of foot-and-mouth disease in the United States and also for the consideration of a bill, H. R. 5098, which says,

To enable the Secretary of Agriculture to conduct research on foot-and-mouth disease and other diseases of animals and to amend the act of May 29, 1884.

We have with us a distinguished visitor who has been attending an advisory meeting of a foot-and-mouth-disease conference this last week, which I had the honor of attending. This scientist has been doing research work in foot-and-mouth disease for more than 25 years. Last year he began the study of the Mexican type of virus, which you will hear more about a little later. Dr. Galloway is director of the research laboratory at Pirbright, England. It gives the greatest

pleasure to introduce this distinguished scientist and guest who has consented to appear before this committee to assist us in every way possible that we might get rid of this terrible disease.

Gentlemen, I present Dr. I. A. Galloway of Pirbright, England.

Dr. Galloway, do you have a paper there that you would like to present?

Dr. GALLOWAY. I have prepared a statement and if you wish to hear it, it will take about 10 minutes to read.

Mr. GILLIE. All right, we will have you read that and then we would like to ask you some questions later.

STATEMENT OF DR. I. A. GALLOWAY, DIRECTOR AND SCIENTIFIC SECRETARY, RESEARCH INSTITUTE, BRITISH FOOT-AND-MOUTH DISEASE RESEARCH COMMITTEE

Dr. GALLOWAY. The control of foot-and-mouth disease is an international responsibility and it is highly desirable that there should be free interchange of ideas and views. The task is heavy and the laboratories are few but all should be willing to give of their best. You may ask, and with reason, that special attributes I possess to justify my expressing an opinion on problems connected with foot-and-mouth disease or diseases associated with causative agents or viruses with similar general characteristics to the virus of that disease. I can say only that I have been associated with and extremely interested in research into such virus diseases in general and foot-and-mouth disease in particular for some 25 years and for the last 8 or 9 years I have been held entirely responsible for everything that goes wrong in the Research Institute of the British Foot-and-Mouth Disease Research Committee.

You may consider that this is not a very good background and that such a person might have "gone stale" and that it might be better to seek the opinions of someone who could view the problem in better perspective, one who had not had "his nose so close to the grindstone." That, however, is for you to judge.

The extenuating circumstances are that I have on occasion had an opportunity to have a glimpse at the outside world and to appreciate the activities of other laboratory workers in the same field. At intervals over a period of years dating from 1925, I have paid visits to research centers engaged on the foot-and-mouth-disease problem, research centers installed on the mainland, "set-ups" in the precincts of a town, or again built on islands, islands which started as such but which, owing to ultimate appreciation of the difficulties attendant on the carrying out of prolonged research of this type may have become transformed into peninsulas with artificially produced isthmuses by virtue of the construction of suspension bridges, islands which at certain seasons of the year become connected with the mainland by a sheet of ice rather than remaining separated from it by a sheet of water, and finally a research center on a small peninsula.

I have thus been in a fairly good position to appreciate not only the trials and torments of those engaged on this problem but also the points which must be considered in setting up a new research center to study the disease. Now, with regard to this great scourge, the United States is in a similar position to that in which Great Britain found

herself some 30 to 40 years ago. As the result of what has transpired during the last 18 months, the threat of the possible introduction of foot-and-mouth disease into the United States, which is always present, has become more imminent. This change of situation, fraught with great danger, has been created by the occurrence of the disease in Mexico with the nearer approach of the infection to United States territory. Now three or four decades ago Great Britain had to consider exactly the same type of problem that your officials are obliged to consider now. Officials in Great Britain, after deliberations initiated by public criticism, decided to explore the possibility of carrying out research on the disease with a view to devising means, whether by protective inoculation with vaccines or other procedures whereby it might be rendered less harmful to the livestock industry.

Owing to a certain amount of opposition, especially from stock owners, to any proposal for the setting up of a research center on the mainland of Great Britain, first consideration was given to the possibility of carrying out experiments on the disease in India. Some officials were sent out to explore the possibility but they soon came to the conclusion that, owing to the apparent variable susceptibility of cattle in India, arising either from the resistance of different breeds or due to the fact that the disease was endemic in the country and that the animals tested had acquired resistance by having passed through the disease before, there was no assurance that early and rapid progress could be made there in a direction which would be of immediate service to stock owners in Great Britain itself. Later on, with the same restrictive concepts in view, an attempt was made to pursue experiments on the disease on a boat moved off the coast of England. This shows that what extent scientists against their better judgment are obliged to yield to uninformed opinion. This fantastic project was soon abandoned as being quite impracticable and the floating swan assumed the attributes of a white elephant.

It was not so justifiable to pass over lightly the suggestion which has come up again and again of installing a research station on a small island rather than on the mainland. One can fully appreciate the qualms of some, especially stock owners, who may visualize the research center becoming a greater menace than the potential risks of introduction of the disease from "over the border," in other words, the fear that the attempted cure might be worse than the disease. Suffice to say at this point that, although it is easy to understand that the uninitiated could indulge in the entertainment of such fears, provided all the necessary special precautionary measures are taken as regards provision of structural protective systems, control of specially trained personnel with bathing and changing regulations and the wearing of protective clothing, air-conditioning, disinfection, and the suitable safe disposal of infective effluent and animal excreta, research on this highly infectious and contagious disease can be carried out with a great margin of security on the mainland.

It must be appreciated that although the measure of security against spread of the disease given by the installation of a research institute on an island may appear appreciably greater at least on paper than if the institute is on the mainland it may in actual fact not be so and any apparent advantages are heavily outweighed by the many disadvantages and high impracticability for a long time policy of re-

search. It would take too long to elaborate on this question here.

The question of research on foot-and-mouth disease on a small island received early consideration in England but finally in 1924 a committee was appointed and it was decided that a research center for the purpose should be set up on the mainland. The Pirbright Research Institute of the British Foot-and-Mouth Disease Research Committee is situated in a country district on the county of Surrey about 30 miles from London. There is a restriction order in force to prohibit the grazing of susceptible farm animals in close proximity to the institute. There are about half a dozen small dairy herds within between one-half and 2 miles range so that the immediate vicinity is but sparsely populated with cattle and other susceptible farm stock. There are a number of larger dairy herds within 5 or 6 miles. In spite of this fact, owing to the stringent rules in force there has never been any evidence that any outbreaks of foot-and-mouth disease in the area have been due to escape of infection from the institute.

Foot-and-mouth disease cannot be considered as being endemic in Great Britain. It is introduced from outside at irregular intervals and cases occur sporadically, this fact, and the geographical position provide conditions which are conducive to the adoption of a "stamping out" policy (that is the rapid elimination of affected animals, disinfection, and application of a stand-still order). Nevertheless it has always been realized that in those untoward circumstances which might arise in which this policy broke down it might be necessary to consider other methods of control such as vaccination either alone or judiciously combined with slaughter such are in application in other countries which are less favorably placed.

For this and another reason it was considered essential that research on foot-and-mouth disease should be pursued in Great Britain. The other reason was that it was felt that any results of experiments and tests would be useful to other countries in which the disease is endemic and when those countries used them in methods of controlling and preventing the disease in livestock this would have the general effect of diminishing the amount of infection about and thus the risk of introducing the disease into Great Britain. Under the exigencies of war or in circumstances in which it was not possible for any reason to keep pace with the rapid spread of infection a stamping-out policy which involved slaughter of farm stock and disinfection alone to the exclusion of other preventative measures such as vaccination by itself or combined with slaughter of susceptible farm stock, would have to be abandoned.

Now, the United States of America at the present juncture cannot afford to view the position with complacency and adopt the slogan "It can't happen here." The urgency of the situation must not be forgotten for the enemy is at the gates; "yet a little sleep, a little slumber, a little folding of the hands to sleep so shall thy poverty come as one that travelleth and thy want as an armed man." Let us now assume that full agreement has been reached or since this is a goal not easy to attain that at least the weight of opinion is in favor of the urgent necessity of setting up an institute of sufficient capacity for long-term investigations on foot-and-mouth disease or if occasion arose other diseases of a similar nature which might threaten the livestock industry of the United States; and on territory of sufficient

acreage to allow of some extension should accommodation of one sort or another be ultimately required. Then it is apparent to all that the next step requires a considerable amount of careful reflection and that step is the selection of a suitable site.

Let us suggest that within the limitations of human wisdom we come "as a prophet new inspired" to visualize its location. Such a site should not be only imaginary when considered in relation to the geographical attributes of the United States and there are no doubt wise counselors attendant upon us with charts, maps, compasses, and the like. The spot which would provide ideal conditions is on a sea-board and preferably on a small peninsula rather than on an island. So that the matter may be clear in our minds the definitions of a peninsula given in the Webster's Collegiate Dictionary, thin paper edition de luxe, are as follows: a portion of land nearly surrounded by water and joined to a larger body (the body in this case is the United States of America) by a neck or isthmus or alternately any piece of land jutting out into the sea. Our site should preferably be on a portion of land which would conform rather to the first definition as regards disposition than to the second and in any case the narrower the isthmus the better. The portion of land itself should be an area in which the population with cattle and other susceptible farm stock is of a low order. The site selected should be within reasonable distance of a large town in which there is a university and other research institutes, schools and colleges so that the numbers of the scientific staff engaged in the research can commune with their fellow workers in similar and other fields of study. The proximity to the sea or at least to an efficient sewer system would facilitate the safe disposal of disease infected effluent and manure after suitable preliminary disinfectant treatment. The fact that the sea would be a means of approach to this favored location would be an advantage in those dire but one hopes rare circumstances which might arise and make it well-nigh impossible or at least inadvisable to use transport by land for bringing susceptible experimental animals to the research or what might under the stress of disease spread have become a vaccine-producing center. In the offing there should be schooling facilities, medical and dental treatment, social amenities and diversions.

So much for the site. Now it is perhaps not fully appreciated how costly research on foot-and-mouth disease is and it would perhaps be as well if some stress was placed on this. The eight samples of virus had been collected in Mexico from different centers of infection and these were transported to the Research Institute of the British Foot-and-Mouth Disease Research Committee at Pirbright. It was necessary to examine these in great detail in order to determine whether there was only one type of infective agent involved, to investigate the characteristics of the virus and to carry out at the same time vaccination experiments. In this work 527 cattle have been used to date at an average price of \$104 per head plus 477 guinea pigs at a cost of about \$800, making a total cost of \$55,000. Now, this money was expended in investigating just one problem. It is necessary to carry out the studies on cattle and working with these is costly not only in respect to the animals themselves but in providing suitable accommodations for them. Elaborate experimental units have to be specially constructed to house the experimental animals so as to obviate the possibility not

only of virus escaping from the institute and being carried to livestock outside but in order to avoid accidental infections within the confines of the institute which would vitiate the results of experiments. These are exceedingly costly, as air-conditioning should be provided to include air sterilization, all the feeding arrangements have to be specially constructed, separate passageways, impervious walls and flooring must be provided, bathing and changing units for personnel must be erected (as the staff have to wear special clothes inside the institute and special rubber kit on entering the units where the experimental cattle are kept, there must be a laundry unit for the sterilization and cleansing of the clothing, disinfection tanks must be provided for the virus-infected effluent and suitable installations made for the disinfection of manure and there must be incineration for burning animals, as well as a small canning plant so as to salvage such meat as may be suitable for food.

Now, it has been the experience at Pirbright that owing to insufficient accommodation for housing experimental animals and insufficient facilities, progress is relatively slow and there are so many problems which have to be tackled, when considering the setting up of a new research institute for the purpose under discussion, it should be appreciated at the start that it is no use tackling the problem half-heartedly. As only those who have worked intensively on foot-and-mouth disease can assess, the investigations are costly if reliable information is to be forthcoming and gratifying results produced. It is exceedingly costly by virtue of all the special demands which are made in this type of research for efficient control and disinfection and it must of necessity be planned on a long-term basis.

Although by experiments on small experimental animals much useful information can be obtained about the disease, in the light of our present state of knowledge, extensive experiments on cattle are very necessary.

There must also be ratproof fencing, changing rooms and baths for personnel at the entrance of the experimental units, all these additional to all the laboratories, services, administrative offices, a library, and so forth, which are required in the usual type of bacteriological research. There have to be large buildings for storing cattle for long-term duration of resistance tests after vaccination and also similar housing for cattle immune to the different types of virus. There are at least three different types of virus and recovery from infection with one will not prevent an animal becoming infected with the second or third type; these type-resistant cattle are used for distinguishing the types of virus recovered from outbreaks in the field. The existence of the three types of virus requires the attendance of a specially selected and trained staff. Let it be reiterated that the research has to be planned on a long-term basis and the provision of accommodations must be liberal and adequate to insure that the work is not held up by bottlenecks. Some major experiments in cattle may take 2 to 3 months to complete and the cattle concerned have to be under examination in closed units during this time. If only a limited number of units are provided, it is not difficult to see how the rate of progress must be diminished.

MR. GILLIE. Before we proceed any further, I wonder if the rest of the witnesses and the guests wish to sit up here in these chairs so that they can hear better. They may do so if they wish.

Dr. Galloway, you made a statement in your paper a little while ago about many countries in Europe where the disease is endemic. That means it is there all the time. But you said it was not endemic in Britain. Did I understand you to say that?

Dr. GALLOWAY. Yes. I think we consider that the evidence is that it is introduced from outside at irregular intervals. It is not like on the Continent of Europe where they never actually get rid of the disease. There are waves of infection which rise to a peak and there are periods in which there is a trough, but during the period in which there is a trough there are always sporadic outbreaks occurring. They never actually get rid of the disease, but there are periods in Great Britain when we are free. That means to say that the slaughter policy gets rid of the infection which appears to be introduced from outside and we can, under these conditions, which is a point to consider, obtain cattle of which we have the history and reasonable assurance that they have not been infected with foot-and-mouth disease before nor have they been in contact with foot-and-mouth disease before. That is an important point in the research program, that you should have a readily available source of susceptible animals.

MR. GILLIE. We heard a story a year or so ago. Perhaps you can straighten it out for us. We heard of a British soldier who was visiting in Germany and visited some of the farms in there and then came back to Britain, infected his own father's herd. We heard that story a year ago.

Dr. GALLOWAY. I did not quite catch the last part.

MR. GILLIE. He came back home to visit and brought the disease with him and infected his father's herd.

Dr. GALLOWAY. I am afraid I have not heard the story.

MR. GILLIE. That may not be true. You would probably know about it, would you not?

Dr. GALLOWAY. I think I should have heard of it.

MR. WORLEY. It would be quite possible, would it not?

Dr. GALLOWAY. I should think it is a fairly remote possibility, unless it was done intentionally.

MR. WORLEY. You mean it would be a remote possibility for a man to carry the disease from Germany into England and infect cattle.

Dr. GALLOWAY. I should think it was a fairly remote possibility. It could occur. One could not exclude the possibility. But I think it would be fairly remote unless he was doing it intentionally.

MR. WORLEY. I am no scientist or an expert on the disease by any manner of means, but we have had testimony to the effect that any number of ways or agents can carry the virus, including human beings. Are our witnesses wrong?

Dr. GALLOWAY. No; that is correct, that the infection can be carried.

MR. WORLEY. Then why do you say the possibility is remote, that the soldier visiting in an infected area could not infect his father's herd in England?

Dr. GALLOWAY. Well, considering the methods of control. This was a soldier?

MR. WORLEY. The story we got was that he was a soldier.

Mr. GILLIE. That is right; he was a soldier and he happened to visit one of the farms in Germany where the foot-and-mouth disease was and then he went back to England and visited his father on the farm and in that way infected his father's herd.

Dr. GALLOWAY. Well, I think all one can say is that disease can be carried mechanically if people are not cleansed. That is why we have all these strict protective measures.

Mr. GILLIE. If that soldier wore the same shoes that he wore when he visited this German farm, he could carry the germs, could he not?

Dr. GALLOWAY. All that I can say is that I have no evidence either in one direction or the other. Of course, if he had come straight across without cleansing himself, it is a possibility.

Mr. GILLIE. Then, in your opinion, it is not so dangerous?

Dr. GALLOWAY. I beg your pardon?

Mr. GILLIE. Then, in your opinion, it would not be so dangerous in carrying the disease from one country to another?

Dr. GALLOWAY. I think if that happened often we would get more incidents in Great Britain because there is a considerable amount of traffic between one country and another. One has to take into account on these things the chance factor.

Mr. WORLEY. Do you have a quarantine around the British Isles?

Dr. GALLOWAY. For personnel, you mean?

Mr. WORLEY. Yes. That is, are disinfectants used on all people coming into England?

Dr. GALLOWAY. No.

Mr. WORLEY. But you still say it is a remote possibility that this virus can be carried by a human being under the circumstances outlined by the chairman?

Dr. GALLOWAY. It seems extremely difficult to imagine that he had worn the same clothes and that he had been handling the animals and that his shoes had not been cleaned. The chance of there being a certain amount of virus there cannot be excluded but the chance element certainly comes into it. The evidence is that you have to have a fair amount of virus before you get the infection. You can't exclude the possibility, of course, that it could be carried in that way.

Mr. GRANGER. Mr. Chairman.

Mr. GILLIE. Mr. Granger.

Mr. GRANGER. I would like to ask the gentleman this question: Do you know of any instances in your experience where this disease has been carried from an infected area into Great Britain or anywhere else by a human being?

Dr. GALLOWAY. You mean from abroad?

Mr. GRANGER. Yes.

Dr. GALLOWAY. There has never been any definite proof that it has been transmitted in that way.

Mr. WORLEY. Then how did it get into Great Britain?

Dr. GALLOWAY. Well, there are a number of different opinions with regard to how the disease gets into Great Britain, and there seems to be a considerable amount of circumstantial evidence that infected meat or meat products, offals, have to be considered as a possible source of danger.

Mr. WORLEY. Infected meat?

Dr. GALLOWAY. Meat or meat products imported from countries in which the disease is endemic.

Mr. WORLEY. That is the only source you know of which transmits the disease; is that correct?

Dr. GALLOWAY. It has also been suggested that it may be brought in mechanically by birds, but then we have no direct proof for that.

Mr. WORLEY. Doctor, can you tell us exactly, without voicing opinions or theories, what brought about the infestation in England?

Dr. GALLOWAY. Well, with regard to scientific proof, I think one has to say that if one was proceeding to investigate the question, for example, of birds bringing the disease into Great Britain, that that would be almost an impractical proposition. There are thousands of starlings that migrate from the continent, and the experimental evidence is that it could be carried mechanically by birds on their feathers or their feet, but probably only small amounts of virus would be carried and perhaps not all birds would be infected.

Now, if we were going to set out to try and catch birds to examine them we would be doing nothing else, and we would make no progress in other important work. We wouldn't be able to tackle problems like the examination of the Mexican virus.

Mr. WORLEY. So it is not positively known whether birds transmit the virus or not?

Dr. GALLOWAY. There have been experiments done at Pirbright. These were artificial experiments in which birds were flown from infected animals into boxes where susceptible animals were kept. These experiments were carried out under artificial conditions, of course, and the evidence on those experiments suggested that they would not hold the virus very long, that they would free themselves from the virus but that would not exclude the possibility, as transit from the Continent by flight is relatively short. The only thing one can say is that the general impressions are that if birds played a very great part in the transmission it would be much wider spread in Great Britain than it actually is.

Mr. GILLIE. Mr. Granger.

Mr. GRANGER. Dr. Galloway, are you familiar with the practice we are now engaged in in Mexico in respect to disinfecting persons and vehicles and the like from the infected territory into free territory.

Dr. GALLOWAY. Yes, sir.

Mr. GRANGER. Would you say that is an unnecessary precaution?

Dr. GALLOWAY. No; not at all.

Mr. WORLEY. You do not do that in England, though?

Dr. GALLOWAY. With regard to vehicles? We do.

Mr. WORLEY. Or people?

Dr. GALLOWAY. We do within the country. If we have an outbreak in the country on one premises, that premises first of all has a stand-still order placed around it. It comes under police control and all vehicles and personnel going onto those premises either have to wear protective clothing and be disinfected, and there their cars are disinfected—

Mr. WORLEY. But you wait until the outbreak has already occurred before taking those steps?

Dr. GALLOWAY. Yes.

Mr. GILLIE. Dr. Galloway, you mentioned in your paper this morning about the possibility of locating a research laboratory at its best place, and that the best place would be close to the sea.

Dr. GALLOWAY. That has always been my position. At least you have one side where there is no chance of infection. You can bring in uninfected cattle by sea if by any chance you cannot bring them by land. It is one of the problems, you may be interested to know, that we have at Pirbright, that the lands we have are restricted and there are no sewers in that actual area and it would be much more satisfactory if we were able to put our disinfected fluids into a sewer system.

Mr. GILLIE. What is the location of Pirbright with reference to London?

Dr. GALLOWAY. We are about 30 miles from London and the way that we get rid of our effluent infected fluid is to place it in disinfection tanks and hold it with the antiseptic for a period and then it is allowed to drain out through marshland into a stream.

Now, as the station expands the strain which is put on that system becomes very great. There is no sewer system in the area. It is all done by these septic tanks and obviously in the old days we perhaps only were doing small experiments, since the war we have been working on a larger scale in which we may have over a hundred animals under experiment at one time and there is a considerable accumulation of fluid and solid matter which has to be gotten rid of. That is a problem where I think proximity to the sea would be an advantage.

Mr. GILLIE. You would recommend that from your point of view?

Dr. GALLOWAY. That is my opinion.

Mr. GILLIE. How about an island off the shore, say 5 or 10 miles?

Dr. GALLOWAY. I think the disadvantages of that, the chief disadvantages, quite apart from manipulation of equipment and animals, is the human factor with regard to the staff as such. There are islands where research work has been carried out in foot-and-mouth disease, and these vary in size from a small island up to a larger island, but they find great difficulty in maintaining what one might call a satisfactory psychological make-up in the workers. They have a sense of claustrophobia, being shut up on an island, and if the staff are unmarried they become restless and have a tendency to become nomadic, and if you have wives and families there may be tense periods when they find it difficult to get along. You have to consider the schools and medical services. I think that is one of the problems they have had on all these islands where the work has been carried out. You have already got great difficulty in picking a satisfactory staff for carrying out this work. They have got to be temperamentally suited for the strain which is already put upon them in carrying out all these disinfection processes. If you add to that by obliging them to work and live on an island, I think you may find there are considerable difficulties.

Mr. GILLIE. You would say the human factor then is very important?

Dr. GALLOWAY. A very important one.

Mr. GILLIE. If the laboratory was to be set somewhere on an island, you do not think it would be satisfactory?

Dr. GALLOWAY. Well, that is my impression. It might depend upon the vicinity to the mainland, but I think you would get the same measure of protection almost if you had a peninsula with a narrow isthmus connecting it so that the only communications were not across water, and quite apart from that in some of the islands, where they have got this working, they had not appreciated that the sea may freeze over so the protection which is given by the water is not always there.

Mr. GILLIE. Doctor, you have been doing considerable experimental work in connection with the virus of the Mexican type. Have you any idea how much material you have used or how many cattle, or guinea pigs you have used in that experiment so far?

Dr. GALLOWAY. As I said in my statement, there were 527 cattle to date and 477 guinea pigs, and horses which I have not mentioned.

Mr. GILLIE. Did you get any appropriation from us for that work, or did you do that on your own budget?

Dr. GALLOWAY. We did that on our own budget.

Mr. GILLIE. That many head of cattle? That is real international cooperation.

Dr. GALLOWAY. Five hundred and twenty-seven.

Mr. GILLIE. Mr. Granger.

Mr. GRANGER. I understand, Doctor, in the early part of your statement you said one of the expensive items in carrying on these experiments was the buying of cattle. Is that right?

Dr. GALLOWAY. That is right; the cattle are expensive, yes.

Mr. GRANGER. I mean exclusive of hogs and sheep?

Dr. GALLOWAY. Well, of course, they are less expensive.

Mr. GRANGER. What I was wondering, will the same experiment on a hog or a sheep apply to a cow?

Dr. GALLOWAY. No; there is considerable evidence that you get a certain amount of species adaptation. That is to say that there are strains of foot-and-mouth virus which, when they affect hogs, seem to have a certain affinity for that species and they lose a certain amount of their ineffectivity on other species. We have examined strains of foot-and-mouth virus which have originated from what you call hogs and those strains will spread easily in hogs. You can carry out experiments in hogs, but we find greater difficulty in infecting cattle with those strains. In some cases you may passage them back again through cattle and they become adaptable to that species. That makes it difficult to superimpose the results of experiments in one species with experiments in another. When you take sheep, there is a great irregularity in which sheep can become infected with foot-and-mouth disease. Not only that, it is sometimes more difficult to diagnose the disease in sheep. Mouth lesions are transient and you get foot lesions which at some stages of their development may be confused with foot-rot lesions. The sheep cannot be considered as a very satisfactory animal and the results of experiments in sheep could not be used to draw conclusions about the condition in cattle.

Mr. GRANGER. Then you could not carry on a successful experiment by trying to cut down the cost by using hogs and sheep?

Dr. GALLOWAY. That is quite definite. I think you might want to obtain information in these other animal species, but you are much more likely to get satisfactory information working with cattle.

Mr. GILLIE. Mr. Simpson.

Mr. SIMPSON. Dr. Galloway, how long has the research laboratory in England been established and conducting research experiments?

Dr. GALLOWAY. How long have I conducted them?

Mr. SIMPSON. How long has the country of England conducted experiments?

Dr. GALLOWAY. I did not quite catch that.

Mr. SIMPSON. How long has your research laboratory been established?

Dr. GALLOWAY. Since about 1924.

Mr. SIMPSON. Have you done any retrenching on the program, or are you expanding?

Dr. GALLOWAY. We are expanding at the present time. Until the commencement of the war there had been some experiments done, but then it was decided that the station should be considerably expanded, and it is still being expanded.

Mr. SIMPSON. How many research laboratories do you have?

Dr. GALLOWAY. You are referring to laboratories or units for carrying out the experiments?

Mr. SIMPSON. In England.

Dr. GALLOWAY. Oh, in England. There is only one.

Mr. SIMPSON. Did you conduct these experiments off a ship, as I have read?

Dr. GALLOWAY. Yes.

Mr. SIMPSON. Did you have an experimental ship on which you conducted these experiments?

Dr. GALLOWAY. Yes.

Mr. SIMPSON. That was in connection with the present one 30 miles from London?

Dr. GALLOWAY. No; this was before that station 30 miles from London was established.

Mr. SIMPSON. You still have only one?

Dr. GALLOWAY. Only one.

Mr. SIMPSON. What prompted it in the first instance, the seriousness of the disease, or was it all over England?

Dr. GALLOWAY. Yes; it was continually occurring and affecting the stock, and it was becoming quite a serious menace to the country.

Mr. SIMPSON. You do feel that you have obtained beneficial results?

Dr. GALLOWAY. From the work that has been carried out in Pirbright?

Mr. SIMPSON. From the laboratory.

Dr. GALLOWAY. Much useful information has been obtained.

Mr. SIMPSON. Are you vaccinating for it in England as a result of these experiments?

Dr. GALLOWAY. We are carrying out no vaccination in the field in England.

Mr. SIMPSON. I think the disease has broken out in this country, and I am estimating, probably once in 10 years. On that basis, would you feel an experimental laboratory was justified in this country?

Dr. GALLOWAY. Well, I think the thing to consider there is that up to a certain extent you have been lucky in escaping the disease so long. You are in much the same position as we are, and we consider that it is always a potential source of danger. We never know when we are going to get the disease into the country.

The policy has been remarkably effective in preventing the disease, but one knows that untoward events may arise which would interfere with that policy, and one has always to provide for them.

For example, during the war period it was realized that the circumstances there might make it difficult to maintain the policy as such, and under those circumstances it would be necessary to have some other method of control, and that is why greater attention was given to vaccination than ever before.

Mr. SIMPSON. Have you any idea, for the benefit of the committee, what has been the total cost of this laboratory in England since 1924?

Dr. GALLOWAY. I could obtain those figures, but I have not got them at my fingertips.

Mr. SIMPSON. Would you do that?

Dr. GALLOWAY. I will do that.

Mr. GILLIE. How many employees do you have in your laboratory?

Dr. GALLOWAY. Well, I should say that in the first place we are not fully staffed.

We have had difficulties in securing staff, and, as this place is isolated, it has become necessary to build housing accommodations in the area so that we can bring staff near.

We found during the war period we had to bring them long distance in view of the housing difficulties, and it was very difficult to retain staff. I should think that altogether there are probably about 60 or 70 people at the station.

That, you will realize, is a small research station which is only capable of tackling a limited number of problems.

Mr. GILLIE. Mr. Worley.

Mr. WORLEY. Doctor, this Government has spent nearly \$40,000,000 in Mexico trying to keep the foot-and-mouth disease out of this country. Why should we deliberately turn around and allow the disease to come into this country and take a chance on infecting our cattle? We are trying to keep it out, not let it in.

Dr. GALLOWAY. I did not quite gather the purpose of your remark.

Mr. WORLEY. I say this Government——

Dr. GALLOWAY. Has spent \$40,000,000.

Mr. WORLEY. We have spent \$40,000,000 in Mexico. I do not recall offhand just what the Mexican Government has spent, but they are also appropriating services and money on the program.

We have spent nearly \$40,000,000 to keep the disease out of this country. Now, what justification would there be for Congress to do an about-face and let the virus in?

Why should we take a chance and risk bringing the virus into this country with the possibility or probability of infecting our herds?

Dr. GALLOWAY. Well, I think that is one of the points that I covered in the statement, that we were in the same position in our country.

Mr. WORLEY. But it was already in England.

Dr. GALLOWAY. It was coming into England periodically, but it was not considered as endemic in the country. It was simply a potential risk that was considered so great that we ought to do something about it, so that we could provide for extraordinary conditions which might arise in which the disease did spread, with the risk of that becoming endemic; or the other attitude was taken that any research

that we did would be of extreme value in diminishing the incidence of the disease in other countries and therefore lessen the risk to ourselves.

Mr. WORLEY. This country has been lucky, you say, in not having more outbreaks. Do you not think we have been a little more careful, rather than lucky?

Dr. GALLOWAY. Perhaps I did not express myself quite correctly. I think the methods you have used to control it are very good, but it is not always certain that there may be contravention of regulations.

Mr. WORLEY. One of the methods we have used is the absolute prohibition of importing cattle from any country infested with foot-and-mouth disease.

Dr. GALLOWAY. Well, the position is that, if you provide an institute that is suitably installed for carrying out this research and you have suitable regulations, the risk is not great.

Mr. WORLEY. Even with the most careful safeguards, we have no assurance that it will work, since we do not know how many different ways it can be carried.

Dr. GALLOWAY. Well, there is no doubt about it that you are correct in pulling me up on that question. When I say that you are lucky, I mean that you have all these regulations in force, but one must always consider illegal methods of things being brought into the country over which one has no control.

There is the same condition in our country. With regard to the risks that are attendant, I think one has to consider that the institute in England has been running since 1924 and there has never been any proof that the disease has gotten out of the institute.

The point is that you have to have a trained staff, and in many cases, if you had that research institute, we would consider that the risks were greater there than the importation or contravention of regulations with regard to importing things into the country, very much less, because you are dealing with something your staff knows something about and they know how to control it.

Mr. WORLEY. Are you familiar with the law which authorizes the cooperation of this country with Mexico in its efforts to stamp out foot-and-mouth disease? For your information, it is broad enough, and in fact there is specific authority in that bill, to set up research institutions down there and to do everything necessary to find ways and means to combat that disease.

Why could not that program be carried on in Mexico instead of this Government taking a chance on bringing the disease into this country?

Dr. GALLOWAY. Well, I think to a certain extent I also covered that in my statement. That attitude was taken always with regard to officials in our country, that instead of creating a risk to the stock owners in England by having the research stations which they thought might create trouble, the suggestion was that it should be done abroad, and there was a body of officials who were sent across to India to find out the possibility there.

Now, the conditions in India might be taken as somewhat similar to what they are in South America and Africa and countries in which the disease is endemic.

"They do not have the same control as they have in European countries. There is less certainty with regard to the history of the animals.

The disease among native stock is spreading continually, and there is also uncertainty there as to susceptibility of different breeds.

They have found great difficulty and that has been experienced by workers elsewhere, in getting uniform infection of animals which might be used in experimental work, and it would also vitiate any experiments on the protective properties of immunizing agents. I think that in an international program which might ultimately develop to be interesting, to correlate results obtained in these countries in which these observations would be made with the results that were obtained under standard conditions susceptible to animals, that one could base satisfactory conclusions on these experiments.

MR. BRAMBLETT. Doctor, you compared the situation in England with the situation in this country from a standpoint of periodic appearances of the disease.

Of course, if my information is correct, we have not had an outbreak in the United States since 1929, which was a very small outbreak. There was a large outbreak in 1924 and another in 1913; also, it is my information that they pretty well have settled on what caused those outbreaks; I mean, how the disease happened to come in and get started.

I am very much interested in the fact that you compare the situation and that you say just "periodically" you have it in Great Britain. Will you tell me what you mean by periodically—every 10 or 20 years?

DR. GALLOWAY. No; it is much more frequent than that. I think the great difference between your method of control and ours is that I believe you do not import any meat from countries in which the disease occurs endemically. You import no fresh meat or frozen meat, chilled meat, whereas we do. I think it is somewhere about 60 to 70 percent, if not more, of the meat consumed in Great Britain is imported from countries in which the disease occurs.

MR. BRAMBLETT. I take it that you feel that the incidence of the disease from time to time in Great Britain is because of the importation of meat, then, birds?

DR. GALLOWAY. Well, I do not think you can exclude the possibility, but I think I covered that in my previous reply, in that, whereas you exclude the possibility of birds bringing it in, there seems to be a certain amount of strong, as I recall, evidence that a number of outbreaks—and the statement has been made, I believe, by the chief veterinary officer of the animal health division in his official report, associating with it contravention of swill-boiling order, and that such swill which has not been boiled is a risk.

MR. BRAMBLETT. Some scientists have claimed that the disease itself or the virus can be carried by air. Will you give us your reaction to that type of carrying of the disease into a country?

DR. GALLOWAY. Well, I think the possibility of it being introduced is attendant upon importing any animal products which have not been subjected to some disinfection process.

MR. BRAMBLETT. The thing I have in mind particularly, Doctor, is that some place I read where during a heavy type of fog from the main-

land to England there were a good many people who thought perhaps that the disease was brought in through the air.

Can you react to that at all?

Dr. GALLOWAY. I think it would be difficult to draw any conclusions with regard to that, but there are no means of approaching that from a scientific point of view.

Mr. BRAMBLETT. You would not say that it could not be borne by air?

Dr. GALLOWAY. I think over short distances the evidence is that aero-transmission may take place. It may be with particles of dust or air, which you mentioned, over short distances.

What happens over a longer distance, it is difficult to estimate, but it is because of that risk that in setting up a new center it would be advisable to have air conditioning with disinfection of the air to prevent the possibility of that type of thing occurring.

It is quite possible that modern methods can devise a set-up which we have not at Pirbright, incidentally, for preventing that aero-transmitting. It becomes important. You can experiment from one unit to another. That possibility has been suggested with regard to accidental infection that is sometimes taking place between units, but with modern scientific methods it is possible to have air conditioning and with conditioned sterilized air coming out in the experimental units.

Mr. BRAMBLETT. In speaking again of the periods in Great Britain, you said they occur with more frequency than in this country. Will you explain that? What would be, roughly, your periods in England when you have the incidence of the disease and that you actually consider that you have it, as between those periods when you feel that England is free from the disease.

Dr. GALLOWAY. Well, the experience within the last number of years shows that the last outbreak we had was in November and the previous one was in June.

Now, that is a fairly long period if one takes the periods elapsed over the last 10 years because sometimes the frequency is greater than that.

It may be a period of weeks or most in between.

Mr. BRAMBLETT. The period that you had in mind was several times a year in England as against maybe 10 years in this country?

Dr. GALLOWAY. Yes; but that is gotten to a large extent by your measures of control and not importing fresh meat or meat products from countries in which the disease occurs.

Mr. BRAMBLETT. Will you also tell me, Doctor, if you can, from your experiments and from your research station there, what you have actually done in the way of counteracting the disease after it gets started?

You say you do not vaccinate, so that leaves me a little bit foggy as to the results that you are actually using to move the disease back out and get into this clear period that you have.

Dr. GALLOWAY. Well, I think in view of my position, I have to be guarded on these statements.

I am a scientist and I am not connected with the administrative control of foot-and-mouth disease in Great Britain. I think I should make that statement.

Mr. BRAMBLETT. I was just interested as to how you were able to make any constructive progress there without vaccination.

Dr. GALLOWAY. I think the opinion held is that as long as it is possible by the slaughter method to prevent spread, the question of using any other method of control is not justifiable.

Mr. BRAMBLETT. In other words, if you have a surrounded area that has broken out, you believe in the slaughtering and burial method and use that consistently if it will control the outbreak?

Dr. GALLOWAY. Yes, the point being that in every country obviously the rapidity with which that can be effected must vary. Our country brings it under police control and unless an outbreak is undeclared by a contravention of an order, immediately a farmer gets an outbreak on a farm he is obliged by law to report that to the police.

Obviously he may not fall in with those regulations but under normal circumstances when it is reported to the police, it is reported to the inspection staff of the ministry and if the disease is confirmed as such, even when there are a fairly large number of animals, under normal conditions, as distinct from war conditions, those animals would be underground or burned within 48 hours at the latest, and in many cases within 24.

Mr. BRAMBLETT. I do not want to ask you a question that is not fair, so please do not think I am doing that, but when you have had the experimental station since 1924 and you do not use vaccination, it just is very confusing to me as to the exact purpose of the research station if since 1924 you do not use vaccination.

Then what is the purpose of the research laboratory that you have in England other than to just get facts to go on the disease?

Dr. GALLOWAY. Well, I think I covered that in my statement that in the first place it is felt that one always has to be provided against a circumstance. Supposing there was no research station in the country and supposing that circumstances arose that for some reason, out of the control of the animal health division with an efficient police inspection service that it got away, then considerable criticism would be thrown up by stock owners that there was no place in the country which could provide some alternative measure of control if it came necessary.

That is the immediate effect on the stock owner. Then it is also felt that from a general point of view any information that can be found out places us in a favorable condition in the fact that we have animals of known history. That does not occur in your European countries to the same extent. There is much doubt about the history of the animal. Any information that we can provide which would be useful to countries working under less satisfactory conditions might diminish the amount of infection in the world generally and therefore diminish the risk from one country to another.

Mr. GRANGER. You do mean to say that you are not using vaccination in the experimentation itself?

Dr. GALLOWAY. No; our main program is on methods connected with vaccination. I think the other gentleman was referring to the use of vaccination in the field as a method of control.

Mr. BRAMBLETT. That is correct.

Mr. GRANGER. Then there certainly would be some answer to the problem if you use it in the station. I would not want to use it in the field either, for that matter.

Mr. BRAMBLETT. There is another question. Perhaps you can answer the question as to exactly what has been accomplished as far as the number of years from 1924 to 1948 is concerned, from the standpoint of the experiment stations and I am wondering if we should develop one if we would have probably the same incidence before we accomplish something that could be used in the field, if that were necessary.

I am still confused on that point and I hope somebody clears it up. I would like to ask this, though, Doctor: You suggested and said that you have made in England considerable, or had taken part in a considerable amount of research on the Mexican situation and named a number of cattle and horses and pigs, and so forth, guinea pigs.

Those experiments were all carried on in England?

Dr. GALLOWAY. What experiments?

Mr. BRAMBLETT. The ones you had reference to.

Dr. GALLOWAY. Yes; these experiments were under standard control conditions.

Mr. BRAMBLETT. How did you get your material from Mexico to England to carry on that experiment?

Dr. GALLOWAY. Well, perhaps I could refer to one of the other witnesses to explain their position.

Mr. BRAMBLETT. If that will be taken care of later, that will be fine. I am interested in that very definitely from the standpoint of how much you have done and whether you moved live cattle or just specimens and how they were moved.

Dr. GALLOWAY. It was virus samples that were carried under conditions which would prevent breakage.

Mr. BRAMBLETT. With regard to the island, I was very happy to have you testify, and I hope I understood you correctly, that an island was not good for the reasons which you listed in your testimony and for reasons which may come out later in the hearings.

I would like to ask you if you think an island the size of Puerto Rico would be one that you could not use because of its size.

Dr. GALLOWAY. I am afraid my knowledge of geography is not sufficient to tell me what acreage of Puerto Rico is.

Mr. BRAMBLETT. Well, of course, it is a very large island. Still I was getting at the fact that, if the island was large enough—that was really more your objection to an island, was it, the use of a small island?

Dr. GALLOWAY. There is not only that factor, sir, there is the factor of the staff itself. The island in Germany was much larger than the island in Denmark, but they did have these staff problems.

You have got to consider that the research worker as such has to maintain contact with his fellow workers in other fields of virus study if the work is going to be developed and he has to have opportunities of communicating with other people.

Now, even if you have a large island, you have got to allow those people off the island.

You may imagine that you are going to keep the people on the island indefinitely. The people, the children, the wives, must come

off the island, and you have got a considerable amount of transit. Well, you are really collecting factors to a large extent by even having a strip of sea if you can have a peninsula or isthmus over which you have control.

Mr. BRAMBLETT. I think I understand. Getting into a larger island like Puerto Rico, I thought perhaps most of those things could be taken care of as you spoke of and yet not where you have the research station you are going to have some human elements involved that will be disconcerting at least, I should think.

Dr. GALLOWAY. On an island, I think people as a general rule have a feeling of claustrophobia. You must have regular ferry services at a certain time of the day. Somebody may want to leave the island at certain times and it is not possible to do so. There is a sort of impression on the research worker that affects him. There have been considerable periods in which on these islands they have had difficulty with regard to staff, with regard to their psychological stability.

Mr. BRAMBLETT. Thank you very much, Doctor.

Mr. GILLIE. Mr. Simpson.

Mr. SIMPSON. Dr. Galloway, you say you do not vaccinate. I believe they do vaccinate in Denmark and that is not very far from you.

Have you any information as to how they are getting along with their vaccination there?

Dr. GALLOWAY. From the reports that they have made, I understand they have had very good results.

Mr. SIMPSON. I did not hear you.

Dr. GALLOWAY. The reports that they have made have suggested that they have had exceedingly good results.

Mr. SIMPSON. That cost was prohibitive?

Dr. GALLOWAY. I did not say so.

Mr. GILLIE. We did not quite understand you, Doctor.

Dr. GALLOWAY. I say that the reports that they have made indicate that they have successful results.

Mr. SIMPSON. Now, do they have an experimental station in Denmark, do you know?

Dr. GALLOWAY. They have, yes, on an island.

Mr. SIMPSON. They have about 10,000 islands over there. They could spare one.

Dr. GALLOWAY. It would be very difficult to set up a station not on an island.

Mr. SIMPSON. Then you do feel that in the Danish experiments the vaccine has been successful, or do they feel so?

Dr. GALLOWAY. They do, yes.

Mr. GILLIE. Doctor, one more question: Is there a possibility of the United States making some sort of an arrangement whereby we might be able to assist you with your research laboratory; in other words, have the two countries worked together? Could your laboratory be enlarged or improved in order that both countries might carry on their experiments right over at Pirbright?

Is that a possibility?

Dr. GALLOWAY. I think the indications are that the limits of expansion that would be possible in our research station would be not sufficiently great to tackle the problem on the scale which is necessary.

The space is limited and it would be possible to expand it but I think that if this is going to be tackled by a country which is setting up a research institute that it wants to be done on a sufficiently large scale.

Mr. GILLIE. Mr. Granger.

Mr. GRANGER. One more question: I am sorry to keep adding to these questions.

Oftentimes the Congress is condemned by some countries that produce meat animals for export saying that our present law quarantine was a camouflage and it is for the purpose of keeping competitive stock out of the American market. They say when meat is frozen, all the dangers of the virus disappear. Would you say that our quarantine law as it now exists is justifiable in the interest of the American people?

Dr. GALLOWAY. It is exceedingly necessary.

Mr. GRANGER. Exceedingly necessary?

Dr. GALLOWAY. Yes.

Mr. GRANGER. And there is a danger, and to your satisfaction you have proven that this virus may be carried by meat that is just frozen?

Dr. GALLOWAY. That is very necessary. A misconception which often arises is that people talk about meat without thinking of the carcass as such.

Now, with regard to meat that is chilled, the flesh itself is not dangerous because there is an acid change that takes place in the animal associated with changes after death.

But virus can remain in the blood, which is not affected by those changes, in the bone marrow, and in the internal organs or offals.

As regards freezing, in all those tissues, apart from the flesh itself, freezing would have the effect of conserving rather than killing the germs.

It is known, for example, that quick-frozen meat, and that affects also the flesh, is much more dangerous than the chilled meat because the quick-freezing is carried out before these changes take place.

You do not get the acid fermentation and the meat itself may remain infected. We have done experiments which have not yet been published but we have examined quick-frozen meats during the war. We had a lot of meat that was imported into our country which was boned and suggestion was that it would be dangerous because boned matter was more dangerous than anything else.

But I think it was about 1 percent of the meat that came into the country was quick frozen and we carried out some experiments to find out whether there was any greater risk with that than with meat which had been frozen after post-mortem changes.

We have kept tissue for a considerable number of months under freezing conditions.

We have not taken it to the limit but for many months it will remain infected under those conditions.

Mr. GRANGER. As a result of your experience since 1924, have you made any discoveries that would indicate you are on the right track and you are going to find the answer to this virus problem?

Dr. GALLOWAY. Well, I have only directly been associated with the Pirbright Laboratory since 1939. There have been a considerable number of observations that have all been useful in advancing and

fitting into the jigsaw puzzle with regard to devising methods which would be practicable.

It must be understood that it is for that reason that we always have to consider long-term research. The progress is slow. It is much slower than it is with many other kinds of diseases in which it is possible to use small experimental animals.

Of recent years we have been chiefly interested in devising methods of testing vaccines under standard conditions and determining standard methods of potency of infected agents. That is going to be extremely useful, the data that we have obtained, and other institutes are probably developing along the same lines under difficult conditions.

Those comparisons should be useful in assessing the immunizing power of vaccines that could be applied.

Mr. GRANGER. Thank you, Doctor.

Mr. GILLIE. Any other questions?

Mr. BRAMBLETT. Just one more. In your experiments on the Mexican type of foot-and-mouth disease, have you got any results yet that you could tell us about in England because of your experiments there as to the Mexican foot-and-mouth disease?

Dr. GALLOWAY. Well, that information has been passed on to the joint commission. What information did you want, particularly?

Mr. BRAMBLETT. I was interested in the type of virus, if you have definitely set that type as far as your research is concerned, and any other information that you would like to give us.

Dr. GALLOWAY. Well, I think one point we have to remember with regard to that question is that we have examined a considerable number of samples from Mexico and all the indications are that those samples all belong to what we term as one immunological type.

Now, examination of other samples will be continued because what we have got to remember is that well, when you have got a vast country in which disease is occurring that your sampling must to a certain extent be taken over a certain period and you must make sure there is no change in the characteristic of the virus or there is no possibility of another virus of a different immunological type occurring.

You realize that chance and possibility comes into this, that the more samples you take, the more accurate information you have.

All we can say is that up to the present time the samples we have examined have all been of one immunological type.

Mr. BRAMBLETT. Then, however, you have all different types of virus when you have the disease?

Dr. GALLOWAY. That is introduced at irregular intervals. There is no uniformity. We may have one for a long period, an A type only, or we may have an O, or a C type, and there are also occasions when you have more than one original outbreak at a time at different centers and you may find that you have two different types at the two different centers. It is a variable position as it probably coincides to a certain extent with the incidence of disease in the country from which the infection is imported.

Mr. BRAMBLETT. But your examination so far shows you have only one type in Mexico, the so-called A type, even though I understand that is not a sure test. At the same time, that is where you are now.

Dr. GALLOWAY. Yes.

Mr. BRAMBLETT. Thank you.

Mr. GILLIE. Dr. Galloway, we certainly have appreciated the opportunity of having you come before this committee and through the committee we want to thank you for appearing before us and giving us information on this subject.

It is a quarter of 12 and we are going to try to run on until about 1 o'clock if we can, if the bells do not ring for us, so we are going to call on another gentleman who is quite famous in this particular line of work; Dr. Traum is a member of this foot-and-mouth division. Dr. Traum has probably given more time and study to this disease than any other man in this country today. Dr. Traum and Dr. Mohler have done a lot of work on this. Every time the country has had a suspicion of some foot-and-mouth trouble they have called Dr. Traum. Dr. Traum is a professor of veterinary medicine at the University of California, at Berkeley, Calif. I am going to ask him to take the witness chair.

**STATEMENT OF DR. JACOB TRAUM, PROFESSOR OF VETERINARY
SCIENCE, UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA**

Dr. TRAUM. My name is Dr. Jacob Traum, professor of veterinary science at the University of California and I am also a member of the advisory research committee. I have not any statement except that being a member of the advisory committee for foot-and-mouth research, and we have a report proposed 3 months ago and I think part of this may be read at this time as an introduction to any questions you may want to ask me.

If it is all right with the committee, I shall read part of this report.

By way of introduction I might say that we have divided our suggestions for research into two parts, one is a short-term research program which we considered urgent and immediate and the other was a long-term one.

Since this particular bill has to do with the long-term research, I will limit my statement to the long-term research unless you want to go back to the other.

The committee met in September, on the 21st. This report was issued in October. [Reading:]

The long-term program should be undertaken on United States soil, either on an island or on the mainland, where suitable and adequate facilities for housing the necessary numbers of large and small animals can be provided, where strict isolation can be practiced, and where proper provisions can be made for the research study of all phases of foot-and-mouth disease and, should the need arise, other highly contagious diseases which are not now epizootic in the United States.

The recommended long-term research program on foot-and-mouth disease is considered by this committee a proper and necessary activity to be undertaken by the United States even though the malady is not enzootic in this country.

In the past, when foot-and-mouth disease made its appearance in this country it was effectively stamped out through the prompt and efficient institution of the slaughter method. However, it is possible that conditions may arise where, in connection with an outbreak of foot-and-mouth disease, it would not be feasible or possible to resort to the slaughter method alone in dealing with the outbreak.

Under such circumstances it would be of the greatest importance that we have the best possible information, necessary facilities, and a properly trained personnel to inaugurate an alternate method of supplementary procedure offering best chances for success in the particular situation. The recommended research would also offer opportunity for the development of new knowledge of the disease.

This might well be of inestimable value in preventing introduction of the disease or in assuring its prompt detection and prevention of rapid spread should it, unfortunately, again make its appearance in this country.

Further, any new knowledge or accomplishments in methods for the diagnosis and control of the disease which may result from research undertaken by this country, when made available and utilized by countries in which the malady commonly exists, would lessen the hazard of the disease being introduced into the United States.

Mr. WORLEY. What was the last part of your statement, Doctor?

Dr. TRAUM. The substance was that any information which may be gathered would help us in detecting the disease and may help other countries in eliminating the disease there and therefore I can say indirectly protect us too.

Mr. WORLEY. Why could that program not be carried on successfully in Mexico where the disease already exists?

Dr. TRAUM. Well, in the first place, we are hoping that it will not exist there very long. We are trying to stamp it out. Of course—

Mr. WORLEY. No one has had the courage to predict just how long it will be before we eradicate the disease in Mexico. Some say 5 years, some say 10, and some say 20, some say never.

Dr. TRAUM. That is right.

Mr. WORLEY. What do you think?

Dr. TRAUM. I really do not know. I have not been down in Mexico. I really could not tell you just how long it will be. It may be endemic there for a long time. We hope that it will be stamped out.

Mr. WORLEY. Of course, we are trying to do that.

Dr. TRAUM. I will say I have not the least idea but I do not know enough about the circumstances or conditions as they exist in Mexico for me to sit up here and testify in an expert manner regarding conditions there.

Mr. WORLEY. What is your second objection to experimenting in Mexico rather than here?

Dr. TRAUM. Well, in the first place, I would ask why should we ask the Mexican Government to set up an experimental station for information that we want to have for our own use?

In the second place, we do not have the control. I suppose from what I hear there is a great deal of difficulty in getting uniform action on most everything and we—if we operated an experiment station there we would certainly want to have the full, complete control of that and we certainly could not have it in Mexico or any other country excepting on our own soil and under our own directions.

Mr. WORLEY. On that point, and the other members can correct me if I am in error, several of the Mexican officials said that they would be very pleased if we would conduct experiments there.

Certainly they offered every cooperation. Am I correct in that statement?

Mr. GILLIE. Yes.

Mr. WORLEY. After all, we are putting up most of the money.

Dr. TRAUM. I am not in a position to speak there about the political considerations, and so forth, in Mexico, but it seems to me that any research station which we would have under our control would certainly be far better for all concerned than if we had it in Mexico.

Mr. WORLEY. Well, I think we would have control. That is my opinion.

Dr. TRAUM. Well, I do not know that you could guarantee that control. Again I will have to supplement that and qualify it by saying that I am not an expert on the political situation in Mexico and just do not know how things would go but I still maintain that we might in some way supplement or agree on what Dr. Galloway said. We do take all the precautions to introduce the disease and I will say we were a little bit lucky at that. We were a little bit lucky despite all the precautions.

Now, in spite of all the rules and regulations you have regarding Mexican importations of cattle, see what happened. You thought you had that cinched and all the various angles covered and everything else. You see what happened there.

Mr. WORLEY. I will not argue with you as to the desirability of a research station.

Dr. TRAUM. We were lucky. Now, as Dr. Gillie said, I have been sent out quite often where trouble is brewing and where there is a question, and so forth, and so forth. I feel often that we are sitting especially in places like California on a hot box all the time. Although we have rules and regulations you cannot control every piece of animal product that comes in there.

We know that people come in aboard a ship and some fellow would like to take a ham to his best girl in town or somewhere like that.

Excuse me for talking in this fashion. But it does happen. We know it happens. It happens that just this particular ham does not get into the garbage. If this particular ham got into the garbage you would start something.

Mr. WORLEY. There is no difference of opinion, as far as I know, on the desirability of research. The difference of opinion is where it might be located. What is your other objection to using Mexico for a laboratory?

Dr. TRAUM. Well, we would have fuller control of it and I think we would be able to do a better job here. I mean in the United States than in—I think we could do better in the United States than we would in Mexico.

Mr. WORLEY. Why?

Dr. TRAUM. Well, for the reasons that we have complete control of the thing and we would be closer to other research institutions—we have in the United States as good talent on virus diseases as anywhere in the whole world. We have institutions that can be of immediate help right here in the United States and any personnel that you may have anywhere in the country would like to be close to that thing.

Mr. WORLEY. How many do you contemplate employing in this research? How many would you say would be necessary in this research program?

Dr. TRAUM. How many men?

Mr. WORLEY. Yes.

Dr. TRAUM. I believe, if I am correct, Dr. Galloway said that he had 50 or 60. We should at least have that many or more. Dr. Galloway was very modest about the accomplishments there and the use of those accomplishments in effectively helping them control the disease in England and also in the rest of the world.

He was very modest in talking about that.

Mr. GILLIE. Dr. Traum, I wonder if you would speak a little louder?

Dr. TRAUM. All right. I thought I was yelling.

Mr. WORLEY. It would be a simple matter to transport 50 or 60 people down to Mexico when the disease is right there, would it not?

Dr. TRAUM. I have no objection to putting it in Mexico. My personal opinion is that it would be much better and I think just as safe in the United States as in Mexico.

Mr. WORLEY. I cannot quite agree with you on the safety feature.

Dr. TRAUM. Those of us of this committee, or every one of us—we have Dr. Shope, from the Rockefeller Institute, and we have Dr. Hagan, dean of the Veterinary School at Cornell University, primarily a bacteriologist; and we have Dr. Kelser, dean of the Veterinary School in the University of Pennsylvania and primarily, also, a research man in highly communicable diseases and such diseases as rinderpest, for instance; and they feel that with the precautions that could be taken we would be almost absolutely safe.

Mr. WORLEY. You can give no guaranty or assurance that these safeguards would work?

Dr. TRAUM. You could not guarantee anything, but I think those can be made as safe as possible.

Mr. WORLEY. I would not argue that you would try your best.

Dr. TRAUM. I think it could be done.

Mr. WORLEY. The testimony that we have had time after time is that you do not know what transmits this virus and you cannot guard against the wind or the birds and a thousand other things. You cannot eliminate every possibility.

Dr. TRAUM. No; you cannot. We believe that the information gained by the qualified personnel and the material and available facilities for meeting a situation which may arise in the United States any day, and under which it may be decided that we cannot go on slaughtering animals for various public and economic and scientific reasons, justify this expenditure.

You see, what England has done for Mexico, we ourselves should have done. England, by its very kindness and interest in research in general, has made it possible now, even if we are going to be in position to make a better vaccine to be used in Mexico, to vaccinate. They have made it possible for us to know generally what kind of vaccine to use, and that the vaccine now available in Europe can be improved upon for Mexico. European vaccine may be fairly effective, but a better vaccine could be made from the Mexican virus and the English have pointed that out with their 500 animals.

I do not think we should be in the position of asking England to do all that for us at all times.

Mr. WORLEY. Well, she is doing it for herself, too, just like we are doing it for ourselves.

Dr. TRAUM. I think we might learn things that might make even a better vaccine. It might be a means of introducing your knowledge in virus and vaccines. The possibilities are immense.

There are many other ways in which vaccines can be made—safer vaccines, probably better vaccines, more suitable vaccines. But vaccination is not the only thing. The English, by their work, have

pointed out just exactly—not exactly, I would not say it that way—but they know under what conditions a virus will survive in animals, with the salting, and so forth. They have data on that. They can protect themselves a little better than if they had not had that information. They can also transmit that information to us.

Mr. WORLEY. You do not say that the work could not be carried on profitably and as successfully in Mexico as here.

Dr. TRAUM. If it is just a question of opinion, I would say that we could carry it on better in the United States than we can in Mexico.

Mr. WORLEY. That is your personal opinion?

Dr. TRAUM. Yes.

Mr. WORLEY. But you would not say it cannot be done in Mexico.

Dr. TRAUM. I do not know about Mexico, but I think it could probably be done to a certain extent. I feel it could be done better in the United States.

Mr. BRAMBLETT. Dr. Traum, I am very happy indeed to see you get back to Washington. I think this is the first time you have appeared before either the entire Agriculture Committee or the Subcommittee such as are meeting today.

Dr. TRAUM. It is the first time I have ever appeared before any congressional committee.

Mr. BRAMBLETT. I can remember practically 100 percent of the people whom I have contacted from time to time in California and here have spoken so very, very highly of your research and your outstanding achievements with foot-and-mouth disease. Frankly, I was disturbed, as you probably know, a number of months ago and was instrumental in some letters being directed to the Government and to the University of California trying to get you more actively engaged in this present problem. It does give me a lot of pleasure to see you here, and I have every respect for your opinion and your background and your ability and what you have accomplished, and I agree with you on research. I have been hammering at it myself as long as I have been interested in foot-and-mouth disease.

I am not sure I would be able to agree, and I certainly am more confused now since you testified to the effect that you would be in favor of research being carried on in this country. I can see no reason why in the last 40 years we have not been taking part in Brazil, England, Switzerland, and Denmark and the rest of these places; why we have not been taking part with our own money and our own men and sharing their cost and also their advancement in the program.

I was going to ask you, first: Are you in favor of this bill?

Dr. TRAUM. Yes.

Mr. BRAMBLETT. You are in favor of this bill, which includes that particular section which states that in the United States the research lab shall be set up.

Dr. TRAUM. Yes.

Mr. BRAMBLETT. It says for research and study in the United States and elsewhere. I am a little vague, but I think they have some authority for research in our emergency bills for elsewhere, and as to the United States I won't ask you for an answer as to whether you would be in favor of carrying it on in California because you indicated a few minutes ago what might happen to you if you did indicate that you would be in favor of carrying it on in California.

I am not sure what would happen to you if you indicated you would be in favor of carrying it on in California.

Dr. TRAUM. We are thinking of putting it down there.

Mr. BRAMBLETT. I much prefer to carry it on in Maine, if we are going to carry it on in the United States. I do not mean that I cannot be convinced if there are enough factors brought to bear.

There was some recommendation by the Department of Agriculture, I believe, or maybe just asking if they could use one of the big islands just off the coast of California not so long ago.

Dr. TRAUM. Yes, I made a visit to Angel Island.

Mr. BRAMBLETT. Then there was some talk of San Clemente Island, which the Government owns. I was not in favor of it at all, but those that were, I remember, had to take a long vacation for a while before they were allowed to come back.

I am rather disturbed, a little bit, but I am happy that you are in it actively, and I hope the Governor of California releases you or, at least, persuades you to put 100 percent of your time into this because I understand we lost one of the other top world experts. He came into the American occupational zone in Germany and offered to give himself up, and he did, and they immediately took him back and gave him to one of the other countries, and since then we have not heard very much about him, if anything.

Dr. TRAUM. Yes; he is back in the Russian zone.

Mr. BRAMBLETT. You do not hear very much from him or what he is doing there, do you?

Dr. TRAUM. No. I think they are trying to put him to work there without any equipment. That is what I understand. I have not been there, so what I tell you is just hearsay.

Mr. BRAMBLETT. That was my understanding, too. I just want to say that I am very glad you are in the program and I was very much interested in your statement.

Dr. TRAUM. I might tell you, Congressman, that I am not out of this thing. I have just been on a recent trip to the Hawaiian Islands for the Bureau of Animal Industry and I am constantly at their call for anything that is on the west coast; or I will come back here for their meetings whenever they call me.

Mr. BRAMBLETT. Thank you very much.

Mr. SIMPSON. Doctor, I am interested in knowing what happens when an animal gets this foot-and-mouth disease. Do they get it on their foot first, or on their tongue first?

Dr. TRAUM. They could get it any place first, but they almost always get it in the mouth first. They could get it any place first.

Mr. SIMPSON. Nobody has been able to find out what they eat or what causes it?

Dr. TRAUM. Well, it is not what they eat that causes it. It is what they eat that contains the virus or any part of them that may come in contact with the virus. There is no difficulty at all, by putting the virus in the mouth of the animal or having a scratch on the foot, or anything like that, in introducing the virus. It is a very highly contagious disease.

Mr. SIMPSON. And there is no information yet as to what actually causes it?

Dr. TRAUM. Oh, yes. It is a virus and that is what causes the disease. It is an ineffective agent that is smaller than any bacteria and passes through the membranes and filters of all kinds that hold back bacteria. It is the smallest of all ineffective agents. It is one of the smallest of all viruses even. For that reason, perhaps, it is a little more contagious. It is just an idea of mine. It is the smallest of most of the viruses. It is way down on the bottom of the list, as far as size is concerned.

The CHAIRMAN. I understand it will pass through a filter; is that right?

Dr. TRAUM. Yes; any kind of a filter.

Mr. WORLEY. Doctor, in February this committee held hearings on the foot-and-mouth situation in Mexico. On page 33 of those hearings, in response to a question by the gentleman from California, Mr. Bramblett, to Dr. Simms, Dr. Simms said:

We are not doing any research with the foot-and-mouth disease. It is so infectious that we have always taken the stand, long before I started working with the Bureau—which I think was a wise stand—that it is too dangerous to work within this country.

I think Dr. Simms is well qualified to state that opinion, and I am sorry to see any disagreement here today.

Dr. TRAUM. Well, I agree with him that it is a very highly contagious disease.

Mr. WORLEY. He says it is too infectious to work with here.

Dr. TRAUM. I agree with him also that under ordinary circumstances there would be a question about whether we should institute any research in the United States. But we have it in Mexico now. I question in my mind which would be the more dangerous—the presence of it in Mexico or in a well-controlled lab. We hope and pray that we will get rid of it in Mexico somehow or another. I question very much whether its presence in Mexico now is any less dangerous than in a well-controlled laboratory which we might institute. I am as much concerned about the introduction of the foot-and-mouth disease in this country as anybody is. I would be the last man to be taking any chances beyond those that are absolutely controllable.

Mr. WORLEY. But you cannot guarantee the virus might not get loose.

Dr. TRAUM. You cannot guarantee anything. You have already proven your laws aren't that good. You have had laws. The disease was introduced in California twice, once after you have had laws.

Mr. WORLEY. This original act was written in 1884, 67 years ago. It has been on our books that long. I believe most anybody will agree that it is working pretty well.

Dr. TRAUM. It has. As I said, we did a good job in the control of these. We were able to jump right on it and get to it. Even in 1924, where it was present in 22 States and the District of Columbia, and then California in 1924-25, where even the deer were involved and we killed 22,000 deer, we still were able to get hold of it and stop it.

My impression is that if in 1914 and in 1924 our condition of food was as it is now there would have been a considerable howl from not only the meat-consuming people but from editorial writers, newspapers, and others.

You have a vaccine available. Why do we not try to use it? Now, that does not exclude the slaughter of animals wherever you think you can get it under. As a matter of fact, every country in the world, or every country in Europe—at least at the time that I was there on the last foot-and-mouth disease commission of the United States, in 1925—had laws on their statute books which provided that if, in the opinion of the sanitary officer, it is possible, by slaughtering the animals, to control the disease, they can go ahead and do it.

Every country had that law. We would not eliminate that. I am sure that even in California, even with the power that the dairy and the livestock industries have there, that there would have been tremendous pressure preventing the slaughters.

For instance, down in the Merced country we had miles of trenches where cattle were buried. I think we ought to have an adequate program with qualified personnel. We are not abandoning the slaughter method. We just should have an alternate or supplementary program in case we do get in a fix.

One of the most prominent agricultural men in this country—and he is a Californian—said to me, “Do you think if we had foot-and-mouth disease right now that we would permit you to slaughter the animals?” He is a very, very prominent man in California. “Do you think we would permit you to slaughter as many as you did last time with the cost of meat as high and scarce as it is now?”

I think we should be prepared to limit that as much as possible. It may be through vaccination or some other method that we may learn by experimentation.

There is a very good vaccine, but it is a crude vaccine. I think we can improve it immensely.

Mr. SIMPSON. Have you any information on the Danish vaccine?

Dr. TRAUM. Excepting what I read and what has been told to me. I have not been to Denmark recently. They claim it is very good and they are using it. They are not having very much foot-and-mouth disease in any of those countries.

Mr. SIMPSON. Have you any information as to what results have been obtained from it?

Dr. TRAUM. Excepting what they report; that it is excellent. But we have to wait and appraise that a little later because it has been the history of the foot-and-mouth disease that it comes in waves. They may have a point where it is at a low ebb and they have practically no foot-and-mouth disease. I would be of the opinion, from what I read and from what I hear, that it is doing a considerably good job in the program of controlling the disease.

Mr. BRAMBLETT. We have spent, at the present time, around \$41,000,000, and, in spending that \$41,000,000, if we kept the foot-and-mouth disease from the United States and held it at this northern perimeter in Mexico I do not feel that the money is wasted. Do you?

Dr. TRAUM. No. Even though it has not been a success from every angle, I think our presence there certainly had a great deal to do with keeping it from getting into the United States.

Mr. BRAMBLETT. It is disconcerting to me, and, I think, to some other members of the entire committee, that every time we have a hearing the whole machinery is reversed or changed around on us so

that it makes you wonder if we are ever going to get started and get some place. We have always been agreed on research, but nobody has seemed to start very much of it.

Now, the gentleman from Texas stated that in February we talked about research and before that the experts would always come in and say, "Don't do it in this country." And if I remember correctly they brought up some incident of hog disease, where the virus was not allowed in here at all, and used it as an example. Yet today we come in with a bill to permit it in this country and we are shifting around so fast and furiously here every time, that I cannot see how those of us who are lay people can be anything but confused.

Dr. TRAUM. If I am not mistaken, in one of your places here they say that the national advisory committee to the Secretary of Agriculture on the control of foot-and-mouth disease in the Republic of Mexico on several occasions has also recommended that active research programs on foot-and-mouth disease be undertaken by the Department. Of course that does not mean by the United States.

Mr. BRAMBLETT. Even earlier than that report we wanted research, and when talking to the experts in Mexico City they took an hour and a half to tell me why it should not be done in Mexico at all. They sounded very logical, too.

Mr. WORLEY. May I ask a question? Who was it who said it ought not to be done in Mexico?

Mr. BRAMBLETT. Well, one of the men we saw in Mexico City said that it should not be done in Mexico at all.

The only other question, Dr. Traum, is, Would you have made the same recommendations last February, after the incidence of the disease in Mexico, as far as it had gone—and I am sorry you have not been down there—but as far as it had gone at the time, would you still, last February, have recommended research facilities be set up in this country?

Dr. TRAUM. I was not sure in my mind about it at that time. I have been debating with myself quite a long time whether or not we have been taking the correct attitude to absolutely prevent research in the United States with the disease. I have been thinking about it quite a bit. I do not know what I would have said at the time. The opposition is so great from everybody that one almost puts himself in a hot spot when he recommends it. I do not know what is going to happen to me when I get back to California, but I am not going to worry too much.

Mr. WORLEY. They cannot vote against you, anyway.

Dr. TRAUM. No; that is one thing they cannot do.

Mr. BRAMBLETT. You can rest assured, Doctor, that they will know about your testimony, and not necessarily from me. I mean they know what is going on here and they are very much interested.

Dr. TRAUM. And they all agree that research should be done. Everyone agrees that research should be done, and I am just asking myself, Why should we do it elsewhere? Why should we not do it on our own soil? Let us grant that it does escape. I think we can keep from letting it escape. See what has happened in England—within about 30 miles of London; within 1½ miles of dairies; 5 miles from large agricultural plots. See what has happened in England.

Mr. WORLEY. It still breaks out over there.

Dr. TRAUM. I will take Dr. Galloway's testimony on the point that they have never proven it to come from their laboratory. I do not know whether this committee knows that I was a member of the American commission sent in 1925 to study foot-and-mouth disease in Europe. We worked with it in Strasbourg and in France. We had a station there, and we know that the disease never got out of our little spot there. The precautions we took were not in any way as great as would be taken by any institute that we would have here. It would not have mattered so much around the country there, but there was no instance where the disease got away from us, and we experimented on large and small animals, hogs, and so on, and we were there for almost a year.

Mr. WORLEY. Where was that, Doctor?

Dr. TRAUM. At Strasbourg, France. There was no difficulty there. We could see foot-and-mouth-disease carcasses at the abbatoirs all the time.

Mr. WORLEY. It really did not make too much difference, did it?

Dr. TRAUM. No.

Let us assume we started in Mexico. Would it not be very easy for somebody to blame the United States station for starting the infection, if it occurred there? Supposing they cleaned it up. Would it not be very simple to accuse us? Would we not feel much better if we started it in the United States rather than starting it in some foreign country? When the disease broke out in Mexico I said, "I wish this had been Georgia or Texas or somewhere else." I meant it.

Mr. SIMPSON. Or California?

Dr. TRAUM. Or California; yes. I meant it. Just imagine what a wonderful opportunity it would give for the people down there to say, "Well, this American laboratory here is responsible for our foot-and-mouth disease here or there," or even miles away when it had nothing to do with an American laboratory.

Mr. SIMPSON. Why not send the proper scientists to Denmark to check with them?

Dr. TRAUM. We did that in 1924. We went to Strasbourg. We worked there. The facilities were just right for us because it was right after the war and the Germans had made wonderful laboratories there available. The French did not have enough money to use them and we located there with American money and we hired a staff and everything else.

Mr. SIMPSON. Did you have vaccine at that time?

Dr. TRAUM. Oh, no.

Mr. SIMPSON. They have vaccine in Denmark now?

Dr. TRAUM. Well, they are making vaccine. We are making vaccine in this country for other diseases. They are in the process of making vaccine on other diseases right now in this country that is going to surprise everybody at the simplicity of it. It is actually made in test tubes, without referring to animals at all. Why can we not do this thing on the foot-and-mouth disease?

Mr. SIMPSON. From an economic standpoint, why would we not be better off, financially, to get some information from Denmark?

Dr. TRAUM. The short-time program which is ready to go into effect almost immediately provides for our sending men to England, to Holland, to Denmark and to not only make vaccine but to stay there and produce the vaccine there and in England with the Mexican virus.

We have made provisions for that, but that is not pertinent to this particular bill. It is something that is being taken care of aside from this bill.

MR. SIMPSON. I am still interested in Dr. Galloway's figure on the cost of this experimental station in England since 1924.

I realize that regardless of the cost it has obtained results, but if it could be done cheaper I would like to know it.

DR. TRAUM. I haven't any idea on that, but it will be costly. It will cost something to build buildings. We are building a veterinary school in California, and we had one building for experimental animals, where we estimated the building cost \$1,000,000 just for experimental animals for our own station to do the experimental work in California.

MR. GILLIE. I might say in connection with this problem, that is what this meeting was called for, to see whether it was going to be possible for us to set up a research laboratory in this country or not. Now, in view of the fact that this disease is so close to our border, I know that we are going to be severely criticized if we do not do something in the line of research. It has worried me ever since the disease has been in Mexico. I have seen it in its worst forms many years ago, and I know the terrible disease it is. I do not want to have it on my shoulders, and I do not think the Bureau wants it on their shoulders that we have not done something along the line of research. Now, for that reason we want to get the views, pro and con, in this meeting today and tomorrow. We want to get it all so that we can get this thing going and get it going quick. After all, the foot-and-mouth disease is pretty sneaky. It will sneak up on us before you know it. We do not know where the laboratory should be placed in this country, but I know from experience, we will have to do something and do it pretty quick. Now, in view of the fact that you have been in various research laboratories all over the world, is it your honest opinion that a research laboratory could be set up in the United States and be comparatively safe as far as spreading the disease is concerned?

DR. TRAUM. I believe so. Of course, in Europe, in view of the fact that they have foot-and-mouth disease at all, they will not be as careful as they are in England. They were very careful in Germany. I was over there. I do not know whether there has been any spread from that institute. Perhaps there has, but in those countries outside of England they would not be apt to be as careful as we could be. During this war, they have worked on virus diseases in human beings. You should see what they have done. As far as the outside world is concerned, they have kept the disease in control.

MR. BRAMBLETT. Mr. Chairman.

MR. GILLIE. Mr. Bramblett.

MR. BRAMBLETT. I just wanted to make this comment. It is my understanding that on the 3d of February there is a meeting here and a report from Governor Warren's committee that have just recently returned from Mexico. I would like to ask you not to try to conclude tomorrow. These boys will be back next week and from what Dr. Traum says, they have a very good short-term program being put into operation at the present time. I would like to see a little more time before we pass or recommend or even be asked to recommend a bill on a long-term program, and give these boys from the Depart-

ment of Agriculture in the State of California who will be here on the 3d of February the chance to testify, too. They have just recently returned from Mexico, which may be of value to this committee.

Mr. GILLIE. With the consent of the committee, we will postpone closing until we get all the information we can.

Mr. WORLEY. Mr. Chairman, when the committee was in Mexico, it is quite true that many members of our own commission down there were opposed to setting up a research laboratory at that time. There was a reason for that. The reason was they thought if we should set up a laboratory and also use vaccines, that it might create a false hope in the minds of the Mexicans that there was some answer known to science to eradicate the disease other than by slaughter. That was the reason for this attitude at that time. The Mexican officials were very anxious that we set up a laboratory and research program. In conclusion, I want to be sure that I understand your testimony, Doctor. You would prefer that the research laboratory be in the United States?

Dr. TRAUM. Yes.

Mr. WORLEY. But you agree that the same amount of work, the same experiments, could be carried on in Mexico as well as in the United States?

Dr. TRAUM. I think there are things that can be done in Mexico in connection with the present outbreak down there, but for long-term research on the problems and phases that we have in mind to do with the foot-and-mouth disease, I prefer to have it in the United States.

Mr. GILLIE. Dr. Traum, we thank you very much for coming before our committee and giving us your views on this important subject. We would like to continue now until 1 o'clock if we possibly can. I would like to ask Dr. Simms if he will take the witness chair at this time.

Dr. SIMMS. Mr. Chairman, I have prepared a statement which will cover our attitude on this question.

Mr. GILLIE. We will include that statement in the record if there is no objection.

(The statement referred to is as follows:)

STATEMENT CONCERNING RESEARCH ON FOOT-AND-MOUTH DISEASE SUBMITTED JANUARY 26, 1948, TO SUBCOMMITTEE ON FOOT-AND-MOUTH DISEASE BY B. T. SIMMS

Research with this disease should consist of two types of work: i. e., that which can be done immediately and a long-range program.

I. RESEARCH WHICH IS BEING UNDERTAKEN IMMEDIATELY

The immediate program is already set up under authority already granted. It consists of work in both Europe and Mexico. Qualified research men will be sent to laboratories engaged in foot-and-mouth disease research in England, Holland, Denmark, Switzerland, and possibly other countries. These men will engage in cooperative work with the investigators in the various institutions, and will also become familiar with the problems concerned with foot-and-mouth disease research and methods of procedure in the various institutions. In this investigational work, experimental animals, including cattle, swine, and guinea pigs will be used, and the appropriate share of such expenses incurred, including special equipment used in this investigational work, will be paid by the United States Department of Agriculture.

The work will cover:

1. Determination of the type of viruses existing in Mexico through animal experimentation and serological means;

2. Methods of preparing vaccines from Mexican and European strains and the testing of such vaccines;
 3. Studies on diagnostic procedures; and
 4. Chemical, physical, serological, and immunological investigation on viruses.
- The Mexican phase of the immediate research program will include:
1. Tests in Mexican cattle of presently available European vaccines against Mexican virus, and the purchase and administration of small lots of presently available European vaccines for use on a field experimental basis in Mexico; and
 2. The preparation of vaccines in Europe from Mexican strains of virus, and the experimental testing of such vaccines on Mexican cattle in Mexico.

II. LONG-RANGE RESEARCH PROGRAM ON FOOT-AND-MOUTH DISEASE

The events of the past year, with respect to the spread of foot-and-mouth disease in Mexico make it highly desirable and necessary that the Department establish a long-range research program covering all phases of the disease. No work has been initiated in this country in the past because the disease was not present, and because of the fear of possible spread of the disease if research work were carried on within the confines of the United States. However, the disease is now prevalent in an adjoining country, and therefore is a direct threat to our livestock industry. Furthermore, air travel has made it possible for people to come to this country from any continent within a very short while. We have thus lost the protection of distance. Therefore, we should begin without delay a well-rounded research program that will supply us with the necessary information for protecting our livestock interests.

The establishment of research activities with foot-and-mouth disease within the borders of this country may give rise to misgivings because of the fear of possible spread of the disease from the base of such activities. The experience of British and other laboratories has demonstrated, however, that such research, if properly safeguarded, can be conducted without fear of spread. We believe furthermore that it is not practical to establish the base of research activities in a foreign country or on some isolated island off the coast. A location on United States territory will insure complete control of the program by the Department.

Since foot-and-mouth disease is the most easily transmitted of all the infections which attack livestock the utmost precautions must be taken in any laboratory in which work with it is done. Specially designed buildings or quarters are necessary. We have set up certain criteria which we believe should be met in the location of facilities which will be used for research operations on foot-and-mouth disease. It is desirable that the laboratory be isolated as far as possible from contact with domestic and wild animals that may be susceptible to foot-and-mouth disease. It should be removed from as much human traffic as possible. It would also be desirable to locate this laboratory in close proximity to other medical-research centers. We have done considerable exploring for suitable locations. Isolated islands, while having certain advantages, have the disadvantage in that a great amount of handling is required of any material needed in research and also presents a very serious problem from the standpoint of personnel. It would be difficult to recruit and retain a sufficient number of trustworthy workers in extreme isolation for any extended period of time. The importance of the project and the part that the personnel will play, not only in carrying out experimental work but also in taking the necessary steps to prevent the escape of the virus from its confines, is such that the personnel should be very carefully selected. Special provision should be made so that the proper type of worker is employed and that those endangering the safety of the project be summarily removed. Satisfactory arrangements to this end should be made with the Civil Service Commission at an early date.

The program undertaken at such a laboratory should include the following:

1. Fundamental research on the virus itself including its physical, chemical, and biological properties and its relations to other viruses.
2. Studies of modes of transmission including carrier animals, wildlife, etc.
3. Attempts at development of better diagnostic methods.
4. Studies of the different strains of the virus and their relations to one another.
5. Attempts to develop more effective and less expensive vaccines.
6. Efforts to develop more efficient methods of disinfecting contaminated premises and areas.

Mr. GILLIE. You may proceed with your oral statement, Dr. Simms.

STATEMENT OF B. T. SIMMS, CHIEF, BUREAU OF ANIMAL
INDUSTRY, DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Dr. SIMMS. Mr. Chairman, I think the two men who have been witnesses ahead of me have covered the subject so admirably that only a very short opening statement is necessary for me. It has been pointed out that we are proposing two types of research. One is a short-time program that can be gotten under way immediately, and the other is a long-time program. The short-time program has not been discussed in detail here and I would just say very briefly that we have already set up as a program for testing vaccines in Mexico. That is being done under the Commission and in cooperation with the Mexicans. We have already made arrangements to send men from our staff to Pirbright, and we are negotiating to send men to the other European laboratories. We have not been ignorant as to what has been going on in Europe. We have had one of our men in Europe visiting all of the laboratories over there within the last few months and in addition to that, Dr. Frankel, of Holland, has been visiting us here. We have had several conferences with him. Dr. Galloway has been here to see us twice and we had a second man in the laboratory at Pirbright. That is in connection with the development of a program of testing the vaccines which are available and of instructing some of our men on the specific methods of vaccine production that are being followed in the European laboratories.

The bill under consideration is one that has to do with a long-time research program. Attention has been called to the policy that has been followed in the past. I feel that we can defend successfully the program that we have followed in the years gone by. I had nothing to do with those policies but I am surely in sympathy with them. As long as foot-and-mouth disease was not present on the North American Continent and as long as we were protected by time, it seemed inadvisable for us to work with the virus in this country. The time protection, however, has disappeared because the disease is present in South America, Africa, Asia, and Europe and airplanes come from any of those continents here in a question of not very many hours. Despite the efforts on the part of our customs officers, it might be possible for somebody to bring in at some time some virulent material.

Mr. WORLEY. Would you prefer to complete your statement before questioning?

Dr. SIMMS. No; I would be perfectly willing to answer questions now. I am not reading anything.

Mr. WORLEY. May I have your permission, Mr. Chairman?

Mr. GILLIE. Yes.

Mr. WORLEY. The fact is, Doctor, we have had but few outbreaks in this country, have we not?

Dr. SIMMS. That is correct, we have had no outbreak since 1929.

Mr. WORLEY. Why did you change your mind between February and now as to the desirability of bringing the virus into this country?

Dr. SIMMS. In February I was of the opinion that we still might stamp it out in Mexico by the complete-slaughter method and I hoped that that could be accomplished in a matter of 1 to 2 years. I was hoping that the major part of the disease could be encompassed within

a year and then perhaps in two more years we could do the mopping up work. At that time I felt—and I still think——

Mr. WORLEY. But we knew at that time that the disease existed in Mexico.

Dr. SIMMS. That is correct. I felt then that any research work that was done in this country or any research work that was done in Mexico would lead the Mexicans to think that just around the corner there is an easy way.

Mr. WORLEY. I think all the committee agreed with you.

Dr. SIMMS. Yes; I felt it would be inadvisable then to start research work in this country or in Mexico, that applied equally to the two countries.

Mr. BRAMBLETT. Will the gentleman yield there?

Mr. WORLEY. Yes.

Mr. BRAMBLETT. Dr. Simms, to bring me up to date, because of the realistic failure of our program in Mexico, you now are in favor of research in this country?

Dr. SIMMS. That is correct. Now, I realize when we undertook research in this country, we are assuming what they call in military parlance a calculated risk. There will be some danger. I do not think we can ever eliminate that danger. We might say we can eliminate it, but I do not think we can. However, we do know from the experiences of the other workers and particularly from the laboratory at Pirbright, England, that as time goes on, the accumulated knowledge that we have as to methods of handling these laboratories makes that danger constantly less.

Mr. WORLEY. Doctor, you said a few months ago that it was so infectious that it was entirely too dangerous to work with in this country.

Dr. SIMMS. And I will defend that attitude today.

Mr. WORLEY. To me that is the whole thing. The only question in my mind is not a question of the desirability of research, but it is, as you say, a calculated risk. I think it would be far more desirable to go as far as we can in Mexico. At least we have been able to keep it out of the United States so far, and let us do what we can down there without taking any chances on that calculated risk. We do not have to take it.

Dr. SIMMS. We have given quite a lot of consideration to the possibility of setting up a rather extensive research laboratory for a long-time program in some other country than this one. We have considered Mexico and South American countries. We have discussed working in some of the European countries and discussed the possibility of working in Africa. We have also discussed the Philippines. There are advantages, as we see it, and disadvantages to either decision which might be reached. In Mexico, as we see it, it would be these: One is, we are working in a foreign country whose Government, we know, has not been too stable in the past.

A second factor is personnel. It is difficult to assign people outside of this country for long periods of service. Most of our men who are working in Mexico have a wonderful morale and esprit de corps. They are down there working hard and they have done it with a minimum amount of complaint. But a research man becomes more valuable as time goes on and we would want people to work on this job not 2 years or 3 years, but 10 or 20 years.

Mr. WORLEY. You think it would take that long to get the job done?

Dr. SIMMS. Yes. I visualize a laboratory that would be working for at least 10 or 15 years. The knowledge that we would develop, I would hope, would be like a snowball. The further we went the faster it would grow. But I do not think that we would have all the answers in the foot-and-mouth disease in a period of 2 or 5 or 6 or 8 or 10 years. I would call your attention to the fact that some of the very best research people in the whole field of medicine have been working with the foot-and-mouth disease continuously for a long time. We do not think that we are any better than these other people. We do not think we will have a staff that is better than the one at Pirbright, for instance. We think we are fortunate if we have one that is a little better equipped than the one at Pirbright so we might be able to do some things they have not done.

Now, the personnel problem becomes a very serious one when we attempt to assign a man outside of this country for a long period of time. In fact, it is almost impossible. We realize that most of this work will be done by men in the ages when they have families and when they have children. They just do not want to go away from home, leaving their families here for their children to be educated. They do not want to go away from home and take their children with them so they will be educated in a foreign country.

Mr. SIMPSON. Will you yield, Mr. Worley?

Mr. WORLEY. Yes.

Mr. SIMPSON. At that point, if I may interrupt, if this legislation becomes public law, how much would your Division want to ask for as an appropriation for it?

Dr. SIMMS. We are working on plans for a building or a set of buildings at the present time. We have not been able to get figures from the architect as to the approximate cost. We hope that we will have the figures on just an approximate cost of the building and the equipment within the next few days.

Mr. SIMPSON. Have you any idea of the amount you will ask for?

Dr. SIMMS. We feel quite sure that to put up the proper type of building and to equip it properly it would be a good many millions of dollars.

Mr. WORLEY. About how many?

Dr. SIMMS. Well, we would be surprised if it was less than 15 or 20 million dollars.

Mr. WORLEY. Up here?

Dr. SIMMS. That would be up here.

Mr. WORLEY. How much would it cost down there?

Dr. SIMMS. We have not attempted to get costs for Mexico, but we have been told that building costs are a good deal higher down there than up here.

Mr. WORLEY. But labor is cheaper.

Mr. SIMPSON. What about your personnel and all the equipment and everything else to operate it? I think we should know what the total outlay is that you are going to ask for.

Dr. SIMMS. Well, the tentative figures that we have arrived at for operating costs are somewhere around \$3,000,000 annually. Those figures are very tentative and they might be changed considerably in either direction.

Mr. GILLIE. You may proceed.

Mr. WORLEY. May I ask some further questions? I am very interested, Doctor, in when you changed your mind between February and today. What caused you to change your mind?

Dr. SIMMS. The reason I changed my mind was because our program in Mexico had to change.

Mr. WORLEY. Because it stopped? Was modified?

Dr. SIMMS. That is right. As long as I felt that we had a good probability of stamping out the disease in Mexico by the time-tried methods we have used in this country, I thought it would be inadvisable for us to start any research work here which might lead the Mexicans to think we are going to come up with an answer and that they might wait for an answer. But when we realized that the program must change, when we knew that we had the disease within 350 or 400 miles of our border and when we knew, as I said awhile ago, that this element of time which used to protect us to a great extent from these other countries was constantly being cut out from under us—

Mr. WORLEY. What do you mean? We have held it in check down there 300 miles from our border.

Dr. SIMMS. I meant time insofar as transport from other countries is concerned.

Mr. WORLEY. Well, airplanes also come from other infected countries.

Dr. SIMMS. That is exactly the thing I had in mind. Back a hundred years ago when we had very little protection in the way of laws, time and distance protected us, but they are being constantly pushed out of this picture. Now, all of those things have made the calculated risk of its introduction from other countries surely greater than it has been in recent years in spite of our laws.

Mr. WORLEY. Did you initiate these recommendations to set this research bureau up and to bring the virus in here?

Dr. SIMMS. No, I did not initiate it.

Mr. WORLEY. Who initiated it?

Dr. SIMMS. It was initiated by a group of us in conference. I could not say that any one man initiated it. It was talked over by the men in our own Bureau in very great detail as long ago as early last summer. The research advisory committee, of which Dr. Traum is a member, met with us and again the whole thing was gone into with them and with our people and I could not say that any one man initiated it. I would say that it was the agreement among the people in the conference. I do not think any one man advocated and pressed for it. We simply sat down and everybody put his cards on the table. We did come up with general agreement.

Mr. WORLEY. Were your technical experts in Mexico called in for these conferences?

Dr. SIMMS. Yes, that is right.

Mr. WORLEY. What did they say about it?

Dr. SIMMS. Our Dr. Schoening, who is the man who has visited European laboratories, and Dr. Galloway were in Mexico to see conditions down there and the proposal has been discussed with Dr. Schoening and the men under him.

Mr. WORLEY. Did you ask them about setting up a laboratory in Mexico?

Dr. SIMMS. Yes.

Mr. WORLEY. Were they for it or against it?

Dr. SIMMS. They feel definitely that research should be done.

Mr. WORLEY. Where?

Dr. SIMMS. I think they would make the same objections to work in Mexico that I have made. They are agreed, I think, with everybody in our bureau that the program which is being recommended here is a sound one. I would say further that there had been no coercion on the part of anyone.

Mr. WORLEY. You say, Dr. Schoening and those others who had been working in Mexico objected to setting up a laboratory in Mexico?

Dr. SIMMS. They would not object at the present time.

Mr. WORLEY. Did they want one set up down there?

Dr. SIMMS. They want research work done of a testing nature which would necessarily need to be done in Mexico. They are in the process of setting that up now.

Mr. WORLEY. If we set up one here, it might be a duplication, mightn't it?

Dr. SIMMS. No, the work in Mexico is a testing of material which is available at the present time. The one here would work on more fundamental questions. It would be a different type of work. This would be a long-range plan and the one in Mexico is a short-time thing.

Mr. WORLEY. What do you mean by "short time"?

Mr. SIMMS. Well, I mean it is something that can be done from month to month. It can get under way now.

Mr. GILLIE. Mr. Simpson.

Mr. SIMPSON. We have authorized between 45 and 50 million dollars in Mexico for the foot-and-mouth disease, have we not?

Dr. SIMMS. I think that figure is a little high.

Mr. WORLEY. I believe he is talking about authorization, not what has actually been spent.

Mr. SIMPSON. We have spent \$40,000,000 already in Mexico.

Dr. SIMMS. Approaching that.

Mr. SIMPSON. There is still more foot-and-mouth disease there than there was when we started?

Dr. SIMMS. That is right.

Mr. SIMPSON. Will there be another appropriation asked for the Mexican foot-and-mouth disease program?

Dr. SIMMS. Yes, sir.

Mr. SIMPSON. How much?

Dr. SIMMS. If we are to continue working down there, we will have to work with the consent and funds provided by Congress.

Mr. SIMPSON. Approximately how much?

Dr. SIMMS. We have not gone far enough with the modified program yet to make any specific recommendations as to an appropriation. We are working on that and we hope to be able to have those figures in the hands of the Secretary very soon.

Mr. SIMPSON. As well as the research laboratory, there will be additional funds asked for eradication in Mexico?

Dr. SIMMS. That is correct.

Mr. SIMPSON. \$40,000,000 has already been spent or obligated. Assuming that you asked for half of that much, that would be 20,000,000 for the next biennial and if your research laboratory costs

\$25,000,000 we have spent \$85,000,000 in 2 years and so far we have not gotten to first base. What I want to know is: How much did the disease cost this country in 1914 when the epidemic was at its worst? We have had that figure before the committee, I think.

Dr. SIMMS. We have those figures in the Bureau. Unfortunately, I cannot quote them directly. There may be somebody in the group who remembers them.

Do you remember them, Mr. Mollin?

Mr. MOLLIN. No; not exactly.

Mr. SIMPSON. Do you remember them approximately?

Mr. MOLLIN. I think Dr. Mohler made a statement in 1914, but, if I remember correctly, Dr. Mohler made the statement that he thought the various outbreaks, and I think we have had at least nine, cost something like \$200,000,000. That is not just the cost to the Government, but the cost to the individual and the people that are put out of business as a result of the outbreaks. You take many of the men who have their cattle killed and got paid the specified price, they were just practically out of business for a year or two and the loss to them was tremendous. I am very sure in one of the booklets that I published on the subject that I quoted Dr. Moore in the belief that the total cost to this country was \$200,000,000, but there would not have been any such amount spent by the Federal Government.

Mr. SIMPSON. I know Illinois had more herds slaughtered than any State in the Union in the 1914 epidemic, but I do think in all sincerity, Doctor, with \$40,000,000 already spent and probably half of that will be asked for eradication in Mexico and a figure on this research laboratory, I feel that we should have some definite figures before we go into this too far.

Dr. SIMMS. Well, of course, this long-time research program would be predicated on an appropriation. That is, this is an enabling act, as I understand it.

Mr. SIMPSON. This is only an authorization.

Dr. SIMMS. Yes, sir.

Mr. WORLEY. The sky is the limit under this bill. Under this bill it can be a thousand dollars or a million dollars. On the question raised a minute ago, did you not testify once here that the cost to the American economy, if the foot-and-mouth disease broke out over here, could very well be \$1,000,000,000 annually?

Dr. SIMMS. I made a statement similar to that, if the disease became well established in this country.

Mr. WORLEY. It is not well established today, but it may become well established if that virus were brought into this country and got out of control?

Dr. SIMMS. That is correct.

Mr. WORLEY. You still say the wisdom rests on the side of bringing in this virus and experimenting with it, even at the possible cost of a billion dollars a year?

Dr. SIMMS. We think that the danger of the virus escaping from the laboratory would be very much smaller than the present danger of the disease coming in from the outside.

Mr. WORLEY. I wish I could agree with you in your position, Doctor.

Dr. SIMMS. As I say we do not say there is no risk. We feel that it is there but we think it is a smaller risk than the risk of its coming from the outside.

Mr. WORLEY. You said in February: "It is too dangerous to work with in this country." Do you think it is less dangerous today? Do you think you have found in the meantime more safeguards to keep it from spreading?

Dr. SIMMS. In the statement that I made in February, I believe you will find that that was a part of a statement concerning the policy that we had followed down through the years.

Mr. WORLEY. Well, that was your opinion in February.

Dr. SIMMS. Yes. The disease is less dangerous today in a laboratory than it was down through the years because we do know from the experience in other laboratories more about how it can be handled successfully.

Mr. WORLEY. It was dangerous in February but in the meantime you say ways and means have been found to make it less dangerous?

Dr. SIMMS. Down through the years, definitely, ways and means have been found to make it less dangerous.

Mr. WORLEY. But there have been no new ways and means since last February?

Dr. SIMMS. I would say that we have made no material progress in the last 12 months. Of course, there has been a small amount of progress made, but we have made progress in the other direction in that the danger of its introduction from the outside with the disease we know now established in Mexico for at least a long time is much greater.

Mr. BRAMBLETT. Will the gentleman yield?

Dr. Simms, we have been talking about Mexico several times here. The question I would like to ask is the program in Mexico now one of eradication or just one of control?

Dr. SIMMS. The program in Mexico now is still one of eradication but predicated on a long-time control program with eradication as fast as the Mexicans will agree to eradication and only when, of course, they are in agreement with eradication.

Mr. BRAMBLETT. In relation to the program that has recently been worked out with Mexico, is your Department and the Department of Agriculture thoroughly satisfied with the progress at the present time? The new program, I am speaking about, where we hold the northern perimeter and work from that south, as it was outlined to us?

Dr. SIMMS. Your question was: Are we thoroughly satisfied with that?

Mr. BRAMBLETT. Yes, and are all the administrative departments that you know about thoroughly satisfied with the progress today?

Dr. SIMMS. The answer is "No." We have had delays in which we have been disappointed in getting the line set up, getting the organization together along this northern line in starting the inspection work. Now, the inspection work is under way along the line, but there have been delays which have been disappointing.

Mr. BRAMBLETT. Would you object, if and when, to such a station as you have outlined set up in Puerto Rico?

Dr. SIMMS. We do not think that Puerto Rico would be an ideal place for this type of a research laboratory. Of course, Puerto Rico has a relatively large number of domesticated animals the same as we have in this country. That is, their cattle population is quite dense. We do not think that that would be as satisfactory as this

country, partly because of the personnel factors that we mentioned a while ago.

MR. BRAMBLETT. Dr. Simms, the fact that you have the figures you were able to give Mr. Simpson on the cost of building and so forth would indicate that you have some idea as to location. Would that be within, let us say, 30 miles of Washington or New York, as the English station was within 30 miles of London? Here are your facilities, I take it, and your men and their families would be happy in this environment, so the plan that you probably have in mind would envisage the set-up of this station close to Washington?

DR. SIMMS. We are not thinking of the immediate vicinity of Washington as being the most ideal place for it.

MR. SIMPSON. Do you have a definite place in mind?

DR. SIMMS. Well, we have considered several places.

THE CHAIRMAN. I think this will conclude our hearing for today. We would like to start tomorrow at 10 o'clock.

Before we adjourn, I would like to insert into the record a letter and a telegram. The letter is from the National Live Stock Producers Association. It is to Mr. George Reid, clerk, House Committee on Agriculture:

DEAR MR. REID: We appreciate your invitation to appear and testify before the Gillie committee on the question of establishment of a laboratory in the United States to conduct further research on the foot-and-mouth disease.

Our schedule is so arranged that it will not be possible for us to appear on those dates.

We have been very much disturbed over the changes in the program as being carried out in Mexico, and unless some new program is developed by the Bureau of Animal Industry or those charged with the responsibility of protecting the health of our herds and flocks we will be rather reluctant to advise or recommend further expenditures of Federal money on this program.

Apparently, some of our Government representatives have given up the thought of eradicating this disease and are turning their attention toward control. We do not believe it can be controlled in Mexico and are of the opinion if it is not completely eradicated from that country it will be only a matter of time until it will appear in the United States.

I regret we will not be able to attend this hearing and thank you again for extending to us the invitation.

That was Mr. P. O. Wilson, secretary-treasurer, who wrote that letter.

And from Harrisburg, Pa., comes this telegram:

GEORGE L. REID, JR.,

Clerk, House Committee on Agriculture:

Regret unable attend hearing on bill authorizing research foot-and-mouth disease. Urge enactment necessary legislation to provide facilities further research this matter regarded as of extreme important livestock industry.

C. P. BISHOP,

Director, Bureau of Animal Industry.

Tomorrow we will have Dr. Shope, of the Rockefeller Institute and Dr. Schoening, of the Bureau. Following that, I would like to hear from the livestock men.

We will stand adjourned.

(Whereupon at 1:10 p. m., the committee adjourned, to reconvene on Tuesday, January 27, 1948, at 10 a. m.)

(The following was submitted for the record:)

STATEMENT OF REPRESENTATIVE O. C. FISHER, OF TEXAS

Mr. Chairman, the subject of the establishment of a foot-and-mouth disease laboratory in the United States to study this disease is of tremendous interest to the livestock industry and particularly is that true along the Mexican border in Texas. But we seriously question the advisability of establishing the laboratory here within the United States. In that connection, I submit to the committee a telegram from Mr. Vestel Askew, secretary of the Texas Sheep and Goat Raisers Association, Inc.:

SAN ANGELO, TEX.

Hon. O. C. FISHER,

House Office Building, Washington, D. C.:

Our understanding House Agriculture Committee holding hearings on proposed establishment of foot-and-mouth disease laboratory in United States. We favor immediate research on disease but do not believe work on mainland advisable. Would appreciate your efforts along this line.

VESTEL ASKEW,

Secretary, Texas Sheep and Goat Raisers Association, Inc.

ERADICATION OF FOOT-AND-MOUTH DISEASE

TUESDAY, JANUARY 27, 1948

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE,
SUBCOMMITTEE ON FOOT-AND-MOUTH DISEASE,
Washington, D. C.

The subcommittee convened at 10 a. m., Hon. George W. Gillie presiding.

Mr. GILLIE. The committee will come to order.

The witness today is a gentleman who is a member of the Rockefeller Institute, Dr. R. E. Shope.

Dr. Shope has devoted many years of work on various diseases, influenza, both the human and swine types.

He has made many contributions, particularly along the lines of pseudo rabies, swine plague, rinderpest, and encephalomyelitis.

It might be interesting to know of the contribution that Dr. Shope; Gen. R. A. Kelser, University of Pennsylvania; Dean Hagen, of Cornell University; and others in cooperation with United States and Canadian Armies and Canadian scientists have rendered on rinderpest during the war. It was he who assisted in perfecting rinderpest vaccines that produced an active immunity. Very few people indeed knew what was going on upon a little island in the St. Lawrence River, Grosse Isle. As you may know, during the war we were very fearful that Japan would spread a disease called rinderpest, which is a disease with high mortality. They were able to produce this vaccine without very many people in the United States knowing of it.

We would like to give Dr. Shope credit for the part he played in developing this vaccine. Dr. Shope, will you take the witness stand?

Dr. Shope, by the way, is an M. D., but has done a lot of work with diseases of the lower animals. Dr. Shope, do you have a prepared statement that you would like to read?

STATEMENT OF DR. R. E. SHOPE, OF ROCKEFELLER INSTITUTE

Dr. SHOPE. I have no prepared statement.

Mr. GILLIE. By the way, I might say also that Dr. Shope is head of the virus laboratories at the Rockefeller Institute at Princeton University.

Dr. SHOPE. I feel a little like a fish out of water. As you mentioned, I am a physician and not a veterinarian, and I think my sole claim to appearing here is that I have had some experience in working with animal diseases and with highly infectious and contagious animal diseases.

Mr. GILLIE. We would be glad to have you tell us as much as you can about the possibilities of research laboratories in this country for the study of the foot-and-mouth disease. We are pretty well acquainted with your research work, and that is the thing we are interested in at this point, your research work and the possibilities of a laboratory of some kind somewhere so that we can carry on this work.

Dr. SHOPE. I am not quite certain what was said yesterday but my own feeling on the matter is that we should establish a laboratory in this country where the foot-and-mouth disease can be studied safely and under as well controlled conditions as possible.

The situation is a little different than it was before foot-and-mouth disease came to Mexico in that we now have a focus of infection, I believe within 350 miles of our border, which alters the situation as far as establishing a laboratory in this country is concerned.

It is almost as though, for instance, foot-and-mouth disease broke out in Iowa, and in fact it might be even better to have it there than it would be to have it in Mexico, because we would have better control of it then.

If, for instance, the disease should break out in Iowa, that fellow in Indiana, I feel pretty sure, would want everything done to control the disease and find out about it what can be done.

Mr. GILLIE. What is your idea about the safety of a research laboratory set up in this country? What do you think about that?

Dr. SHOPE. Naturally when you bring an infectious agent into a country there is always the remote possibility that something unexpected could happen.

Personally I think that under the conditions in which the work would be done it would be much safer and would present less of a hazard than, for instance, the focus of infection in Mexico would present.

Mr. GILLIE. You have done considerable work in the study of the science of virus diseases. What would be your idea of having this research laboratory set up in some other country, such as Mexico, for instance, or Germany or Denmark? Would that be possible, do you think, or practical?

Dr. SHOPE. I personally would rather see it in this country. My reason for that is that it would be under our own control. We could do the work as we wanted to and without any possibility of interruption in the work due to political unrest or disturbances in the countries in which the laboratories were established.

You can visualize all sorts of emergencies arising whereby a laboratory, for instance, located in Mexico or in general would be absolutely useless to us.

Mr. GILLIE. Supposing we digress for a moment and have you give us a little story about the problem that you had up there at Grosse Isle? I think people pretty well know that rinderpest is a far more dangerous disease than foot-and-mouth disease.

Dr. SHOPE. I think I should say at the outset that rinderpest, while it is highly contagious, does not have the history of spreading quite as rapidly as foot-and-mouth disease.

It is, however, as you have mentioned, a much more severe disease in that almost 100 percent of the population, animal population, die, whereas in foot-and-mouth disease I believe the mortality tends to be considerably lower.

We were faced with an emergency and Goose Isle was picked as the site for the laboratory for several reasons.

First, it was felt that the work should be done on an island because on an island it was felt that adequate isolation could be practiced more easily.

The island had to be chosen because it was in wartime so that it would be defensible against attack.

Groose Isle was above the exposed submarine zone and was considered secure from that standpoint.

Our problem there was to make—there was a known vaccine at the time—to make some of that and then to do research to try to develop something which was more practical and perhaps easier and cheaper to make.

We developed a chick embryo vaccine which we felt was better than any of the vaccines that had been in use. Certainly it was better for use in our own country. It could be produced on a large scale. One egg would give you enough vaccine to make 120 doses, whereas a cow would only furnish about four or five hundred doses.

We instituted all sorts of gadgets for safety, some of which I think would be applicable to any foot-and-mouth disease laboratory that is built. We sterilized all of the sewage before it was pumped into the bay. We sterilized it by prolonged heating. We instituted quarantine measures, so far as personnel was concerned, and did various other things that assured us that the disease would not get off the island.

Incidentally, we had normal animals on the island itself.

We kept them at one end of the island and the laboratory was at the other but in no instance was there spread to the normal end of the island.

MR. GILLIE. Was this vaccine—this vaccine was produced under strict sanitary conditions and no one was allowed on the island except those who were working in the laboratory?

DR. SHOPE. Yes, sir; it was under military as well as sanitary isolation.

MR. GILLIE. Was it under the direction of the two Governments?

DR. SHOPE. Yes, sir; it was administered by a joint Canadian-United States commission, with four Canadians and four people from the United States on this commission.

MR. GILLIE. That is the first vaccine that was produced that set up an active immunity; is that right?

DR. SHOPE. No, sir; there were other vaccines. There are other good rinderpest vaccines. One is known as the chloroform inactivated vaccine and the disadvantage of that is that it is very expensive to produce and the immunity is perhaps not as long as you might hope it to be. Another was developed by Mr. Edwards from England and is a goat-adapted vaccine and the disadvantage of this is that in certain breeds of cattle the use of vaccine is attended by about a 15-percent mortality and we felt that that was too high to even chance using in this country, even in an emergency.

MR. GILLIE. I think it would be interesting for Dr. Shope to tell us where Groose Isle is and how they came to use it up there and at the same time who financed it.

It was financed through the War Department, was it not?

Dr. SHOPE. I think it was financed by the War Department. It was a joint operation. Canada furnished the land and a certain amount of the money and we furnished the rest of the money and part of the personnel. Canada furnished three scientists and we furnished three scientists.

Most of the technicians were from the United States but we had some very excellent Canadian technicians and all of the maintenance and security and other things that go to support a laboratory were furnished by Canada.

Mr. GILLIE. The authority for setting up this laboratory was, as you say, through a joint commission of the Canadian and American Armies, was it not?

Dr. SHOPE. Yes.

Mr. GILLIE. Mr. Simpson.

Mr. SIMPSON. Dr. Shope, have you made any experiments in the vaccination of cattle on foot-and-mouth diseases?

Dr. SHOPE. No, sir.

Mr. SIMPSON. No research of any kind?

Dr. SHOPE. No.

Mr. SIMPSON. Have you any idea about the expense of rinderpest?

Dr. SHOPE. I did not get that.

Mr. SIMPSON. Have you any idea about the expense of your experiments or the joint commission's expense on rinderpest?

Dr. SHOPE. I do not know what that project cost. I was told that it was between 2 or 3 million dollars, but I have never seen any actual figures on it. It was not an awfully large project.

You see, our laboratory staff was only 6, and we had about 30 technicians, and I suppose the military force had a strength of about 120.

Mr. SIMPSON. But you did obtain results?

Dr. SHOPE. Yes, sir.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Chairman, I think it would be helpful to the committee to have the figures on this experiment on rinderpest for our own information, if they are available.

Mr. GILLIE. We would probably have to get that through the War Department.

Mr. SIMPSON. If \$2,000,000 accomplished results it seems unwise to spend as much as contemplated on foot-and-mouth disease.

Mr. GRANGER. Doctor, where did you get the virus with which you experimented?

Dr. SHOPE. It was the strain—known as the Kabete strain. It came originally from Kenya Colony in the Africa.

Mr. GRANGER. We do not know of any of that virus in North America.

Dr. SHOPE. The disease had never been in North America. For that reason our cattle population was completely susceptible. That is, never having been exposed to it, they had developed no immunity.

Mr. GRANGER. Did you vaccinate the cows before they were infected or after?

Dr. SHOPE. They would be vaccinated before they were challenged with a known infectious dose of virus. The infectious virus was from cattle, that is, the virus was from cattle, and on about the fifth

day of infection you removed the spleen and that spleen contains lots of virus. That is what is used to infect animals or to start the egg experiments, that is, in cultivating the virus in eggs.

That is the starting method of that. The vaccine was created by long passage of the virus in hen's eggs until it had become so attenuated that it would no longer kill cattle, and the vaccine that we finally used would produce one spike in about 50 percent of the animals to which it was given.

Mr. GRANGER. Then, normally, if this virus had been spread by the enemy you had enough information to have gone out and vaccinated the livestock?

Dr. SHOPE. Yes, sir.

Mr. GRANGER. And you could have saved the major portion of them?

Dr. SHOPE. Yes, sir; we could have done that, and the immediate immunity develops very rapidly.

If you can get the vaccine into an animal 72 hours before the virus, that animal will be saved. That is, you have first interference and then immunity. It is a very nice type of vaccine to use because it is a live vaccine and not only immunizes but also interferes early in the course of the disease.

Mr. GRANGER. Are there any viruses similar to these viruses which animals are susceptible to?

Dr. SHOPE. I did not understand the question.

Mr. GRANGER. Are there human viruses similar to these foot-and-mouth viruses?

Dr. SHOPE. I do not believe there is a human virus that would be classed in the same class as foot-and-mouth disease. It will supposedly spread to man. It is in the literature that it does. It produces a mild disease. I have never seen the disease.

Mr. GRANGER. In the veterinary's profession you are always dealing with dangerous viruses and disease that spread, are you not?

Dr. SHOPE. Yes.

Mr. GRANGER. Are you able to control those diseases within the laboratory where you carried on your experiments?

Dr. SHOPE. Sometimes your laboratory personnel gets infected but I do not believe I know of a single instance in which human pathogen has spread outside the laboratory, if that is what you mean.

Laboratory infections with human pathogens are very common.

Mr. GRANGER. Then it is your judgment we could safely establish the laboratory we are talking about and be pretty safe from having the disease spread?

Dr. SHOPE. I think so.

Mr. GRANGER. The livestock people want to be sure, and I am sure the members of the committee want to be as sure as it is humanly possible to be sure that we are not bringing something in that might spread.

Dr. SHOPE. A lot depends on the personnel that staff this laboratory. After all, an isolation technique is only as good as the personnel that put it into effect. I think that from a structural standpoint a laboratory can be built which is perfectly safe providing personnel used adequate precautions in going to and coming from the facility.

I think from the standpoint of safety the personnel are of as much or more importance than the type of laboratory itself.

Mr. GRANGER. In our talks of establishing laboratories in some other country, we are always confronted with the idea of dealing with some other country. Some of the people have thought of putting it in Mexico, but we would always be subject to political considerations in this country even if we did establish it there.

Dr. SHOPE. Yes, sir; and supposing Mexico should become free of foot-and-mouth disease? I am sure they hope to become free. Then if our laboratory were set up there and they got a focus of infection, we would really be in the soup. It would be much easier to control an agent in our own country, I think, than in some other country.

Mr. GRANGER. That is all.

Dr. SHOPE. May I answer Mr. Simpson's question?

Mr. GILLIE. Yes.

Dr. SHOPE. Mr. Simpson, on that 2 to 3 million dollar figure, I would like to have you realize that we were very lucky in that. I mean, we could have worked for a long, long time and spent a lot more money. We were fortunate in that the first thing we tried worked.

Mr. SIMPSON. You say you were very lucky?

Dr. SHOPE. Yes, sir.

Mr. SIMPSON. The United States is entitled to a little luck once in a while.

Dr. SHOPE. I think so too.

Mr. GILLIE. You hit the jackpot the first thing?

Dr. SHOPE. Yes.

Mr. GILLIE. I think Mr. Granger had in mind when he asked the question on the infectivity of human diseases and animal diseases, the question of whether anything is more highly infectious than foot-and-mouth disease in human diseases.

Dr. SHOPE. I think the only human diseases which would compare in infectivity, probably, are some of the respiratory diseases, such as influenza of the pandemic type. That spreads more rapidly, I believe, than foot-and-mouth disease does.

Mr. GILLIE. It has a higher infectivity?

Dr. SHOPE. It is just a little different because with influenza you have repeated waves and certain people have a residual immunity so that those people would not come down during a new epidemic, whereas with foot-and-mouth disease introduced into a country like ours where the disease has not occurred, that would encounter no animals immune by virtue of previous experience with the disease, so that I would imagine the incidence would probably be higher in a new disease than it is in a disease which is more or less endemic to an area.

Mr. GILLIE. Have you ever done any work in leprosy?

Dr. SHOPE. No, sir.

Mr. GILLIE. Is that a very highly infectious disease too.

Dr. SHOPE. Well, I do not believe that there is an awful lot known about how leprosy does spread. I think the contact has to be fairly intimate.

Mr. GILLIE. But it is still a very dread disease?

Dr. SHOPE. Oh, it is.

Mr. GILLIE. They have a colony in this country, do they not, that is pretty well protected?

Dr. SHOPE. I believe they do but I know nothing at all about it.

Mr. WORLEY. There is one in Louisiana.

Mr. GILLIE. There is one in Louisiana. That is pretty well protected. Evidently, of course, just as you say, it depends on the group that has charge of that whether it would be safe or not.

Mr. WORLEY. But we did not volunteer to import leprosy originally, did we?

Dr. SHOPE. No; I do not think we know how we got it. Oh, well, I certainly suppose we certainly do know how we got it, but it was certainly not welcome.

Mr. WORLEY. We did not import it for experimental purposes, did we?

Dr. SHOPE. No.

Mr. WORLEY. For the record, Doctor, would you define rinderpest?

Dr. SHOPE. Well, it is an acute, highly fatal and contagious disease of cattle. Sheep, goats, and swine are susceptible.

Mr. WORLEY. All cloven-hoofed animals?

Dr. SHOPE. I think that is true. I guess that pretty well includes sheep, cattle, goats, and swine.

Mr. WORLEY. And deer?

Dr. SHOPE. I do not know.

Mr. WORLEY. I understand deer are also susceptible.

Dr. SHOPE. Then it has been the same range as foot-and-mouth disease.

Mr. WORLEY. Now, would you define for the record foot-and-mouth disease?

Dr. SHOPE. It is an acutely contagious vesicular exanthema of cloven-hoofed animals, I think. I have not looked it up recently, but I think that would cover it.

Mr. WORLEY. Which of the two diseases is more contagious?

Dr. SHOPE. I know by experience only about the cattle plague, rinderpest. From reading the literature, I would gather that foot-and-mouth disease was more contagious than rinderpest.

Mr. WORLEY. Could you tell us in how many different ways the foot-and-mouth virus can be transmitted?

Dr. SHOPE. I think the usual way is direct contact, but it could be transmitted by the secretions or excretions from the mouth or feet of infected cattle, and this, I should think, could be done by indirect means.

That is, people that have handled the thing and that have handled other cattle.

Mr. BRAMBLETT. Will the gentleman yield?

Yesterday we had a little testimony on the fact that it might be airborne for short distances. Can you comment on the fact as to whether the virus could be airborne or not; and also, in regard to rinderpest, is there any possibility of that being transmitted by air?

Dr. SHOPE. I think probably both conceivably could be airborne if the infectious secretions dried enough so that they would become dust particles. Then I think it is conceivable that that could spread that way. I know that rinderpest virus resists drying, and I believe that foot-and-mouth disease virus resists drying up to a certain point.

Mr. BRAMBLETT. You say that it would be air-borne without any question providing that it dried?

Dr. SHOPE. Yes.

Mr. BRAMBLETT. Sufficiently to be carried by the air?

Dr. SHOPE. Yes, sir; I think so.

Mr. WORLEY. Are you through?

Mr. BRAMBLETT. Thank you; yes.

Mr. WORLEY. Then in your opinion and based on your actual experience, the foot-and-mouth-disease virus can be carried by practically any and all means?

Dr. SHOPE. Well, I would not make that quite that wide, but it certainly can go by direct contact; that is, from a sick animal to a normal animal. It can go by what are known as vectors; that is, things that come in contact with sick animals and then get to normal animals.

It probably could also be transmitted as dried material over a short distance of air.

I have no idea, however, the distances that they would be. I suppose it would depend on prevailing air currents and things like that.

Mr. WORLEY. Did you find any cure for rinderpest?

Dr. SHOPE. No, sir. We made no studies on that. As a matter of fact, there is no cure for any virus disease.

Mr. WORLEY. There are no cures for any virus disease?

Dr. SHOPE. That is right. Once an animal or a person is infected, there is not one single thing that you can do. That is, for a pure virus disease.

Mr. WORLEY. Are foot-and-mouth and rinderpest true virus diseases?

Dr. SHOPE. Yes, sir.

Mr. WORLEY. Is there no hope after the animals have contracted either virus?

Dr. SHOPE. Not so far as I know.

Mr. WORLEY. Then the purpose of your research was to develop a vaccine or to try to find a cure.

Dr. SHOPE. I should think the initial purpose of the research would be to develop a more adequate understanding of the disease and perhaps a better vaccine and a more economical one than is at present available.

I have the feeling that anyone who finds something which will affect one virus disease will have made a considerable contribution toward solving some of the others. That has been the history in the past in medical discoveries.

Mr. WORLEY. Do these two viruses have anything in common—that is, rinderpest and foot-and-mouth disease—that you know of?

Dr. SHOPE. I actually do not know of anything in common.

Mr. WORLEY. Has the information that you have developed been made available to this country, specifically to the BAI and other Government agencies?

Dr. SHOPE. Yes, sir; that was published. The work was classified in the beginning, and at the end of the war was declassified and published.

Mr. WORLEY. And this country has full access to all the information?

Dr. SHOPE. Yes, sir.

Mr. WORLEY. You say that particular research was under the dual operation of Canada and the United States?

Dr. SHOPE. Yes.

Mr. WORLEY. Did you notice any conflict between the two governments in the conduct of the experiments?

Dr. SHOPE. So far as the conduct of the experiment was concerned, I think the two governments were in complete agreement.

Mr. WORLEY. They recognized that this was a common enemy; is that correct?

Dr. SHOPE. They recognized that it was a common enemy, and at the time, when we thought it was a real emergency, because we were wide open to the introduction not only of rinderpest but several other diseases. Rinderpest, because it is such a fatal disease, was considered the most dangerous.

If a foreign country wanted to take a chance on biological warfare and attack our animals, it was felt that would be the first one they would choose.

Mr. WORLEY. Was this island referred to located in Canada or the United States?

Dr. SHOPE. It was in Canada.

Mr. WORLEY. In your opinion, was the possible spread of the foot-and-mouth disease any less dangerous than the spread of rinderpest during the war?

Dr. SHOPE. Will you restate your question, please?

Mr. WORLEY. Is not our threat today from foot-and-mouth disease more dangerous than the threat of rinderpest was during the war? Is it not more real?

Dr. SHOPE. I do not know about the comparative threats, but I actually, honestly, feel that we are seriously threatened with foot-and-mouth disease today, more so than we have ever been.

Mr. WORLEY. Why was that island selected, Dr. Shope?

Dr. SHOPE. Well, I had nothing to do with the selection, but I understood that it was selected because it was felt that it was, first, easily defensible against submarine or direct sea attack, and, secondly, it was felt that on an island more adequate isolation could be practiced. You see, we were about 4 miles from the south shore of the St. Lawrence. We had a good water barrier, and that never froze up. Also, it made disposal of boiled sewage much easier. We did not have to tap into anybody's sewer line. After it had been boiled, we could pump it out into the river.

Mr. WORLEY. What agency was charged with selecting that site? Was it the War Department?

Dr. SHOPE. I actually do not know, but I have a feeling that it was the joint commission which was set up to consider potential biological warfare threats and to pick places. I think it was picked by the commission. Naturally, Canada had to give its approval of the location. Before we brought the virus in there, we were subjected to a rather complete inspection of our facilities. We had the job of building the laboratory first, before any infectious agent was brought over. We were to notify somebody when we felt that we were ready. There were some Canadian officials, veterinarians—I think it was the Canadian animal pathologist—who came up and inspected our facilities before he gave the word. He felt in his opinion we had built a laboratory in which the disease could be controlled.

Mr. WORLEY. How was the virus brought to the laboratory?

Dr. SHOPE. It was brought by courier.

Mr. WORLEY. Did it come through the United States or via Canada?

Dr. SHOPE. I think it came direct to Canada. I do not think it ever came into the United States. All I know is that a courier brought that one day. We had been waiting for about 3 months for it. There was a little mix-up in there. We could not mention the disease name, you know. It was called the Reverend Mr. Engling.

Mr. WORLEY. How long was that operation conducted?

Dr. SHOPE. Well, I should say about 3 years that there was work in progress there.

Mr. WORLEY. You had need for no more virus than the first shipment?

Dr. SHOPE. Well, there were other strains brought in subsequently, you see, because it was necessary to make sure that our protection was not against just one strain.

Mr. WORLEY. How big a personnel did you have?

Dr. SHOPE. The first year I should say we had about 30, and the station eventually—you know how a military station builds up in personnel. We eventually ended up with a strength of about 130. Our scientific staff remained the same.

Mr. WORLEY. Were they all scientists, or were they helpers?

Dr. SHOPE. Six were scientists, and we had 30 classified as technicians, and the rest were guards and cooks and firemen and boat operators and things like that.

Mr. WORLEY. Was everyone confined to that island, or were you allowed to come and go as you wished?

Dr. SHOPE. We gave very infrequent leave. Enlisted men got off probably once in 4 months and scientific personnel I should say once in 2 or 3 months.

Mr. WORLEY. Did you return to Canada or to the United States?

Dr. SHOPE. To both.

Mr. WORLEY. You had about an equal number of Canadians and Americans?

Dr. SHOPE. On the scientific staff; yes, it was about an equal number.

Mr. WORLEY. We had testimony yesterday from Dr. Galloway who suggested that the proposed laboratory be located on a peninsula rather than an island. What about that?

Dr. SHOPE. I would like to say something on this island thing. The psychological hazards involved in island research were terrific. Nobody was happy up there. The boys called it the Alcatraz of the St. Lawrence and things like that. I think it would have been impossible to have kept personnel there had they not had to stay there because they were in the Army, you see. If I did pick an island, I certainly would not pick one in that geographical location, because we only had about 3½ months of summer, even considering spring, summer, and fall. The ice freezes over there on the river about in November, and the ice does not go out until April or May. You have a long winter.

Mr. WORLEY. Your objection would be from the standpoint of the morale of the personnel?

Dr. SHOPE. My objection would be that, and also I do not think that an island is absolutely necessary. I think a peninsula might be just as good from the standpoint of isolation and of the added advantage of not presenting a psychological hazard to your personnel.

Mr. WORLEY. I did not quite get that.

Dr. SHOPE. The peninsula would be as easy to isolate, or almost as easy to isolate, as an island, and also it would not introduce this psychological hazard for your personnel that you get on an island.

You would not have the same psychological thing to deal with.

Mr. WORLEY. I understand that the Department has surveyed any number of places in the United States without regard to whether it was an island or a peninsula. I understand that for reasons of economy they have been surveying a number of abandoned surplus Army camps. What do you think about a site such as that in Indiana or Texas or Iowa, for example?

Dr. SHOPE. I think I would be against putting it in the Middle West. I think that would not be advisable.

Mr. WORLEY. You would be against what, please?

Dr. SHOPE. Against putting it in the Middle West, for several reasons. I think it should be outside of the area where your intense cattle population is and where cattle are in large groups and where fencing is not so good. I realize they have plenty of fences in Indiana and Iowa but the plots in the East are smaller. I think I would choose a site on the eastern seaboard somewhere.

Mr. SIMPSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WORLEY. Yes.

Mr. SIMPSON. Doctor, what has happened to this experimental station at the present time?

Dr. SHOPE. The one at Grosse Ile?

Mr. SIMPSON. Yes.

Dr. SHOPE. Well, it is supposedly on a stand-by basis but I think it would require practically as much work to get it opened again to operate now as it did in the beginning. It was built during the winter. We started construction in October and it was completed in February. Most of the cement work was done when the temperature was well below zero. You know how cement work done under those circumstances stands up?

Mr. SIMPSON. It seems if the island and the buildings are still there and idle, that they might hold foot-and-mouth disease experiments there.

Dr. SHOPE. Well, I do not doubt but what it could be done there. From a physical standpoint, that island would be safe to use, but I think it would be a very poor choice for the reasons I have mentioned. One is, it is too far north. That is, the winters are terrifically cold there. Every morning the wind blows first from one direction and then the other, and you have about 8 feet of snow. You have to shovel out all your paths.

Mr. SIMPSON. I realize that and I realize what you said about your buildings being built in the winter, the cement cracking and so forth. At the same time, if the people of the surrounding area did not object too much to the rinderpest experiments, they might already be inoculated and be willing to have the foot-and-mouth disease project there.

Dr. SHOPE. Sir, the people had no idea what was going on. The people in the region knew nothing at all about it. There were all sorts of stories as to what was going on there. One story was that we were a base for replenishing the food on German submarines that came up there.

Another was that we brought German prisoners over there. The windows of our isolation quarters were high and were all barred, naturally.

Mr. SIMPSON. Having conducted experiments on that yourself, you feel it is not desirable to conduct foot-and-mouth disease experiments on that island?

Dr. SHOPE. From my own standpoint I would not feel that it was because it is a miserable place to be. As I visualize the foot-and-mouth disease research laboratory that we have in mind, it is a more or less permanent establishment and one in which if you get a group of scientists working there you will want them to stay. It takes a man about 2 or 3 years to get the feel of a problem, you see.

Mr. WORLEY. It does what?

Dr. SHOPE. That conceivably can take a man 2 or 3 years to get the feel of a problem. That does not mean that you will not get anything in the first 2 or 3 years, but the people that we would have at this foot-and-mouth disease laboratory, I should think, should be what you might call career scientists, people who were going to be in that sort of work for a long time, and I do not think they would be very happy on an island like Grosse Isle.

Mr. SIMPSON. What would you say are the beneficial results that have been obtained from experiments as far as the livestock industry is concerned?

Dr. SHOPE. From rinderpest?

Mr. SIMPSON. Yes.

Dr. SHOPE. Well, fortunately we did not have cattle plague during the war, but I think had we had it we could have controlled the outbreak. The vaccine is being used in China at the present time. It was given a field trial in Africa and I believe it is being taken by the FAO to Siam at the present time for use there.

Mr. SIMPSON. What benefits have been obtained beneficially for American livestock interests?

Dr. SHOPE. Well, you have a vaccine which, in case we ever do get rinderpest, can be used. It is insurance. The benefits from insurance are from not having to use it, I should think.

Mr. SIMPSON. You do feel that the livestock raisers and feeders in the United States have obtained some benefits from that wartime experiment?

Dr. SHOPE. Not directly. The only benefit that they have received would be in case we ever did get rinderpest we would have a good vaccine. It is insurance.

Mr. SIMPSON. I am too much interested in whether an elephant in Siam got it or not.

Dr. SHOPE. The station was not established to benefit us in peacetime. It was established to protect the livestock people during the war in case the disease had been introduced. I mean, if it had been introduced and we had been caught completely unprepared I think we would have been in for considerable criticism. If it had been introduced and it was found that we were prepared, they would have thought we were pretty smart people to have thought of that.

Mr. GRANGER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIMPSON. Yes.

Mr. GRANGER. Then as I understand it, this was a war measure first, to meet any attack that might be made by our enemies. You say the real estate around there was furnished by Canada.

Dr. SHOPE. Yes, sir.

Mr. GRANGER. And all there is left, as far as you people are concerned, is the equipment in the laboratory?

Dr. SHOPE. Well, the laboratory is there, the isolation facilities are there, there is a chicken house there, there is a laboratory cow barn there, and there are three sets of barracks that could be used for housing. There is a power plant. That is about all. The power plant was antiquated when we took it in. You see, Grosse Isle was originally a quarantine station which was closed about 1920 and had been in stand-by since that time.

Mr. GRANGER. Is the laboratory equipment stand-by too?

Dr. SHOPE. No; I think the equipment has been pretty well stripped; that is, things that can be removed like grinders and things like that.

Mr. GRANGER. Then there is not a lot of investment left there?

Dr. SHOPE. So far as the United States is concerned, I think it is completely liquidated. I do not think we have any equity in the place at all.

Mr. SIMPSON. You do not feel that it would be desirable at all for this experiment?

Dr. SHOPE. No, sir; I honestly do not.

Mr. WORLEY. Mr. Chairman—

Mr. GILLIE. Mr. Worley.

Mr. WORLEY. Getting back to the question of where the laboratory should be located, I believe you recommended some place along the eastern seaboard. Could you tell us why?

Dr. SHOPE. Well, the reason for that is that certain portions of the eastern seaboard have a less dense cattle population than other parts of the country and also the herds are smaller and the fencing is better, and it is conceivable that you could prevent direct spread in case something did happen, you see.

Mr. WORLEY. All the testimony we have had is that when the virus starts spreading it goes like a prairie fire and can spread over the country.

It can pump to the State of Washington even if you had it located in New York. It could be transmitted to Illinois or Texas overnight.

What difference would it make whether you were in a thinly populated section so far as cattle are concerned, or in a heavily populated section?

Dr. SHOPE. Well, I do not deny that that can jump large distances, but the way it jumps is by people actually coming from an infected area and going there carrying the virus. That actually has to be transported. I should think the main means of spread was by direct contact of cattle from infected areas going through sales barns and things like that, and getting into clean herds. From that standpoint I think you would be better off to have it in a region that did not have very many cattle.

Mr. WORLEY. Or people?

Dr. SHOPE. I do not think the people are of any serious consequence. They would not be coming and going from the laboratory anyhow. Only your own personnel would have access to the laboratory.

MR. WORLEY. What about this question of the air carrying it, or feed or straw?

DR. SHOPE. Well, you would not use straw. We used no straw at all at Grosse Isle. We broom-finished the concrete. We started out using shavings, but they present too much of a disposal problem. We used no hay, either. The animals were fed ground alfalfa, grain mixture, and beet pulp and were not bedded. So we diminished as much as we could any dust transmission.

MR. WORLEY. There is no question in my mind but that anybody charged with this would have to exercise all the safety measures they could exercise, but at the same time it would be dangerous, in my opinion, gravely dangerous.

MR. BRAMBLETT. Will you yield a minute?

MR. WORLEY. Yes.

MR. BRAMBLETT. Dr. Shope, did you object to a nice large island like Puerto Rico where people like to go, and after a good many of them have been down there their families go and they live the rest of their lives there, and they are very happy? I think you could avoid this psychological situation and carry on an experiment down there. What would be your reaction to that as a location?

DR. SNOPE. Well, Mr. Bramblett, I have never been to Puerto Rico, and I do not have any idea of what it is like.

MR. BRAMBLETT. I think the climate is very desirable. I have not been there, but lots of friends of mine who have say that it is a very desirable place to live, and they go and stay, many of them, for the rest of their lives. It has been an economic problem for the United States. We might have a tendency to help out the economics of the situation by spending a good many million dollars in Puerto Rico to our advantage. That is the reason I do not see any objection to it.

DR. SNOPE. I would have to think that one over, Mr. Bramblett. I do not know how I would feel after I thought the thing out. So far as the hazard is concerned, I do not think a well-controlled laboratory anywhere in the United States constitutes nearly as much of a hazard as the outbreak or the focus of infection in Mexico is right now. It is one thing to have a potentially dangerous agent located at a place uncontrolled, and quite another thing to have it controlled as well as our scientific knowledge enables us to control it.

MR. WORLEY. At that point, Doctor, all the testimony we have had is that the focus of infection in Mexico is controlled. What do you mean by "controlled"?

DR. SNOPE. Well, at least it is out in the open, you see. I visualize a research laboratory as being a closed proposition. While it is controlled in Mexico, there are new cases appearing and they are out in the open. I know that everything is being done to keep it from spreading, but it is quite different from having it in a laboratory under laboratory conditions.

MR. WORLEY. I agree with you there. Have you ever been in Mexico?

DR. SNOPE. No.

MR. WORLEY. You have not studied that operation at first hand?

DR. SNOPE. No.

MR. WORLEY. I understand the climate down there is ideal as compared with Grosse Isle.

Dr. SHOPE. Well, I had a lot of ideal climate out in the Pacific during the war, but I still would not want to put a station like this even on an island like Hawaii.

Mr. WORLEY. Do you know what this Government has spent in Mexico on foot-and-mouth disease?

Dr. SHOPE. Well, I have heard.

Mr. WORLEY. What have you heard?

Dr. SHOPE. I thought it was about \$35,000,000.

Mr. WORLEY. I think the latest estimate is about \$40,000,000, and I do not know how much more we are going to have to spend to keep it down there. As I see this problem, we are reversing a policy that we have carried on ever since the beginning of protection against various kinds of virus. One reason we have escaped more frequent attacks of foot-and-mouth disease or rinderpest or other diseases, is the fact that we have had absolute prohibitions, as far as we could, against allowing any disease in this country. This proposal would reverse that policy.

Dr. SHOPE. Exactly.

Mr. WORLEY. I am trying to see all sides of the question and be as fair as I can, but I cannot see where this Congress would be justified in, on the one hand, spending \$40,000,000 to keep it out, and at this time taking a chance by bringing it in, because no witness has appeared here who can give us any absolute guarantee that it might not spread once it gets into this country.

Dr. SHOPE. But no witness can guarantee absolutely that it will not spread from Mexico at this time, either.

Mr. WORLEY. There is no question about that, but, on the one hand, we are fighting a defensive fight, and, on the other hand, we are simply inviting a calamity by taking an unnecessary risk. Do you deny there is a risk involved?

Dr. SHOPE. No; I do not deny there is a risk, but what I do contend is that the risk would be greater without getting some information. If we could get some information, we could perhaps diminish the risk.

Mr. WORLEY. All right, is not all the raw material you need available in Mexico where the disease actually exists? Is not every virus you need already present there?

Dr. SHOPE. The viruses are there.

Mr. WORLEY. Your facilities are not available in this country. You would have to build them in any event.

Dr. SHOPE. They would have to be built, yes.

Mr. WORLEY. To me, the safest place to build them would be where the disease exists now.

Dr. SHOPE. I can see the logic of your argument, but to me I would much rather, if I am going to have foot-and-mouth disease within 350 miles of me, anyhow, have the laboratory in which I am going to try to control the thing under my own jurisdiction.

Mr. WORLEY. I am afraid that is a defeatist attitude which we must try to avoid. When you say "if you are going to have it within 350 miles of you, anyway," that is a defeatist attitude. If we continue to fight a defensive battle instead of an offensive battle to get rid of it, then, it may eventually spread up here. But do you not think it is the better part of wisdom to do what we can in Mexico to eliminate

it there and at the same time set up any laboratory experiments that can be set up down there rather than invite a risk by importing it into this country?

Dr. SHOPE. I do not think this is any time for half measures, Mr. Worley. I think any laboratory you set up in Mexico—well, as a matter of fact, any laboratory that you set up anywhere to do work within the next 2 or 3 months—and the emergency is that great, I think—would have to be a makeshift sort of thing. It was our recommendation, the recommendation of the Advisory Committee on Foot-and-Mouth Disease Research, that some immediate steps should be taken and those were to utilize present facilities, you see, for gaining information. But in the meantime, we were to get better prepared for a long-term research program. Now, I have no idea whether we are going to have to live with foot-and-mouth disease the rest of our lives, but I just have a feeling that that is a possibility. Whether that is a defeatist attitude or not, I do not know.

Mr. WORLEY. Well, it is not impossible to eliminate it in Mexico. So far we have been successful in keeping it out, have we not?

Dr. SHOPE. Yes; we have certainly kept it out. So far as controlling it in Mexico completely, that is, eliminating it, I think that is a matter which nobody can tell for certain yet.

Mr. WORLEY. No; any more than they can tell whether we could do it here.

Dr. SHOPE. I know every effort will be made to eliminate it.

Mr. WORLEY. You do not know of any time in the history of the United States in which we have deliberately imported a virus which was not already present here, for the purpose of experiment, which is as contagious and can do as much damage as this, do you? We mentioned leprosy a while ago.

Dr. SHOPE. Well, I do not think that is a very good example, because that does not spread as rapidly as some other things. We worked on cholera and typhus and things like that.

Mr. WORLEY. But we had them in this country at that time, did we not?

Dr. SHOPE. Well, not for a long, long time, not cholera.

Mr. WORLEY. We had it when we were experimenting on it, didn't we?

Dr. SHOPE. No, we are experimenting right now with things like that at my own institute.

Mr. WORLEY. You mean things that are not already present in the United States?

Dr. SHOPE. Yes; they are all human diseases.

Mr. WORLEY. Are they as contagious as foot-and-mouth disease?

Dr. SHOPE. Well, I do not suppose they are, although they spread pretty well, some of them. Some of them have insect vectors and, of course, where you have an insect intermediate host, all you have to do is control that to handle the thing. Those are easy ones to work with.

Mr. WORLEY. I think there is bound to be a cure for foot-and-mouth disease or rinderpest or cancer or what not. There is just bound to be and I think it can be found. I am certainly in favor of research but we are late in getting at it. There is a decided difference of opinion, as far as I am concerned, as to what is the most desirable and the safest place to conduct these experiments.

Dr. SHOPE. I can understand your viewpoint perfectly, because I know for years it has been the policy to keep foot-and-mouth disease out.

Mr. WORLEY. It has been pretty successful, has it not?

Dr. SHOPE. Yes, it has been very successful. But this is the first time, as far as I am aware, that we have had a hazard over which we did not have complete control. It would be quite different if the outbreak were in this country. I think you could go in and—

Mr. WORLEY. If it were already here, that would present another problem. But it is not here, and we are trying to keep it out.

Dr. SHOPE. O. K. Supposing it were already here. Then, would your feeling about the establishment of a research laboratory be the same?

Mr. WORLEY. I do not think we would have much choice then, but you are assuming that the danger of infestation in this country is great enough at the present time to justify the importation of the virus.

Dr. SHOPE. Yes, that is my viewpoint, that is right. That is where we differ.

Mr. WORLEY. Yes.

Dr. SHOPE. I think maybe the best time to do this would be before we get it rather than wait until after we have it. As you say, there would be no question about it then.

Mr. WORLEY. But we are not waiting. We can set up down there.

Dr. SHOPE. But we may not have much choice in the thing, you see.

Mr. WORLEY. If it were a question of whether we could do it in this country or nowhere else, I would say go on and do it, but I say you have any number of choices. There is England and many other countries which have been experimenting on it for quite some years. You have a golden opportunity right down here in Mexico to conduct your experiments.

Dr. SHOPE. I would think rather than not do anything, it would be much better to do it somewhere else, but something should be done.

Mr. WORLEY. I agree with you, it is just a question of where.

Mr. GILLIE. Mr. Bramblett.

Mr. BRAMBLETT. Who was the commanding officer of your experimental station, Dr. Shope?

Dr. SHOPE. Well, I was the director. The troops were under the command of a whole flock of different people that came and went. It was a very unpopular station.

Mr. BRAMBLETT. The entire operation was not under one commanding officer.

Dr. SHOPE. No, it was a very complicated command. I was in the Navy, you see. I just had one pharmacist's mate with me. There was United States Army personnel and Canadian Army personnel. Each detachment, so to speak, had its own commanding officer and the Director of Research was Director only of research. That was me. I did not have anything to do with Canadian troops.

Mr. BRAMBLETT. Any unified order had to be agreed on by a board of strategy?

Dr. SHOPE. No; it worked out very well. Things were done the way the Director wanted them done. Where disciplinary things came up, it was taken up—if the fellow was a United States soldier, he

came under the detachment commander and if he was a Canadian, he came under Colonel Cameron. He was designated as superintendent of the station.

Mr. BRAMBLETT. What happened to the vaccine? You indicated after this question came to my mind that it was available in this country because we have been sending it to Siam and China, and so forth.

Dr. SHOPE. Well, the strain which we attenuated—as you perhaps know, live virus will stay alive only a certain length of time without passage. At the end of the war everything was frozen. Everything at the station was destroyed. All infectious material at the station was destroyed. That was understandable. The vaccine, which is a live vaccine, was dried, and I guess there were a couple of million doses of it that were sent to various places where it was conceivable that there might be need for its use.

Mr. BRAMBLETT. That was what you had in mind at that time?

Dr. SHOPE. We thought certainly somebody would keep the thing going, you see. It was sent to China. Some was sent to Greece, and Africa. But unfortunately no one bothered to pass it in eggs, you see, so that that particular strain was lost. Since that time, people working at the laboratory in Kenya have started with four fresh strains of virus and have confirmed our work completely, that passage in the egg does attenuate it for cattle.

Mr. BRAMBLETT. Where did you say they were working?

Dr. SHOPE. At Kabitto in Kenya Colony.

Mr. BRAMBLETT. What would react in the vaccine of a fatal disease such as rinderpest such as foot-and-mouth disease where the actual losses and fertility are very small?

Dr. SHOPE. Will you repeat that?

Mr. BRAMBLETT. What I have in mind is the vaccine that you developed for rinderpest was developed, as I understand, for a fatal disease. The vaccine would stop that loss of cattle directly but in foot-and-mouth, the loss is only a small percentage actually, by death. Now, would it react to the vaccine from that standpoint?

Dr. SHOPE. All that a vaccine does, whether it is a fatal disease or a nonfatal disease, is prevent the disease. So far as vaccination is concerned, I would not think it would make much difference whether you were trying to combat a fatal disease or a disease whose losses are such as they are with foot-and-mouth disease of more economic importance than they are so far as actual loss of life is concerned.

Mr. BRAMBLETT. If we had felt, or if those who were in command had felt that we were just as liable to get an outbreak of foot-and-mouth disease in this country as we were rinderpest, this experimental station, in your mind, would have been set up in this country or anywhere else where they wanted it in complete secrecy the same as your experimental station in rinderpest?

Dr. SHOPE. You mean for foot-and-mouth?

Mr. BRAMBLETT. Yes.

Dr. SHOPE. I do not know. I had nothing at all to do with that. I was just picked and sent up there and given the problem of directing the work.

Mr. BRAMBLETT. One last question. Do you have any objection to the establishment outside of the continental United States if we have control of the situation? You seem to make a point first of the psycho-

logical problem, which I think is not completely insurmountable. Then you made the point of being under the direct jurisdiction of this country. If those two points are met, would you have any objection to the establishment of a research and experimental station outside the continental limits of the United States?

Dr. SHOPE. Well, if you understand what I mean by "control." I mean control at all times and accessibility at all times.

Mr. BRAMBLETT. You mean governmental control?

Dr. SHOPE. Yes; in wartime as well as in peace or in political upheaval, wherever it is put.

Mr. BRAMBLETT. Let us take it for granted that we have that type of control.

Dr. SHOPE. If you have that type of control and providing the area is not subject to tropical storms which—I mean if you got a good first-class hurricane, you could conceivably have the stuff all over the Gulf of Mexico.

Mr. BRAMBLETT. But you are going to take some chances, anyway.

Dr. SHOPE. Yes, but I should think under those circumstances that the location of the laboratory could be in that place.

Mr. GILLIE. Just one question, Doctor. How many head of cattle did you use up there on that Grosse Isle project?

Dr. SHOPE. Well, our barn held 124 and we filled it, I suppose, three times a year. I suppose it would be something under 1,000 head. He used mostly calves.

Mr. GILLIE. How many doses of vaccine did you prepare that you had to store?

Dr. SHOPE. Of the bovine type, that is, before we developed the egg vaccine, we had instructions to have 200,000 doses on hand and in readiness. That was felt to be sufficient to ring vaccinate any spot introductions, you see. After we developed the egg vaccine, we kept on hand about 2,000,000 doses. The egg vaccine—in a week you could make enough to vaccinate all the cattle in Canada and the United States, you see.

Mr. MOLLIN. Mr. Chairman, could I suggest a question?

Mr. GILLIE. Yes, sir.

Mr. MOLLIN. As I understand it, as Mr. Bramblett brought out, the rinderpest is a very fatal disease and the vaccine you perfected, as I understand it, gave permanent immunity; is that correct?

Dr. SHOPE. Well, I think it was probably permanent. We are not sure of that. It was tested after, I believe, 18 months. They were immune after that time.

Mr. MOLLIN. In the case of foot-and-mouth disease where the death loss normally is light, as I understand it, the disease itself only gives an immunity of 12 to 13 months. After many years of experimentation in foreign countries, the best vaccine that has been perfected so far only gives an immunity of 4 to 6 months, although perhaps in some cases slightly longer than that, but generally I think they say around 5 to 6 months. Do you see any possibility of perfecting a vaccine for foot-and-mouth disease that would give longer immunity than the disease itself?

Dr. SHOPE. It has been the history of vaccines that infection immunity is the longest immunity. I think that is right. That is, you would not expect to get longer immunity by a vaccine than you would get by actual recovery from the disease. I think that is true.

Mr. MOLLIN. So that all we can hope for then in the case of the vaccine is to double the longevity of the protection that they now have.

Dr. SHOPE. Yes; except there would be nothing to prevent you from repeating the vaccinations. With some virus diseases you have to repeat your vaccination at periodic intervals. There would be no objection to doing that and keeping up a permanent immunity.

Mr. MOLLIN. Yes; by repeated vaccination.

Dr. SHOPE. Yes.

Mr. GILLIE. Well, Doctor, that is all. We thank you very much for your contribution to this thing. I wish to announce also that in the beginning I forgot to mention that Dr. Shope is a member of the advisory board, of the Foot-and-Mouth Disease Research Committee. That is a very important committee.

Now, we have with us Dr. Schoening, of the Bureau of Animal Industry. We would like to have the doctor come on now.

Dr. Schoening has been with the Bureau of Animal Industry since 1907. He has been Chief of the Pathological Division of that Bureau since 1932. He is also interested in the study of virus diseases and has spent considerable time in the old country studying them.

As I understand it, Dr. Schoening has done considerable work, not only on foot-and-mouth disease but rabies—encephalomyelitis. He was a member of the Department Foot-and-Mouth Disease Commission established in 1925.

Doctor, will you state your name to the reporter? Do you have a paper you would like to read?

Dr. SCHOENING. No; I do not, Mr. Chairman. I do not have any prepared statement.

Mr. GILLIE. If you will state your name to the reporter here, please.

Dr. SCHOENING. My name is Harry W. Schoening.

STATEMENT OF DR. HARRY W. SCHOENING, CHIEF, PATHOLOGICAL DIVISION, BUREAU OF ANIMAL INDUSTRY

Dr. SCHOENING. I am Chief of the Pathological Division, Bureau of Animal Industry, United States Department of Agriculture.

Mr. GILLIE. Did I understand you to say you do not have a paper?

Dr. SCHOENING. No; I have not, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. GILLIE. You may proceed.

Dr. SCHOENING. I might make a few remarks, if you wish.

Mr. GILLIE. Go ahead and make your remarks. After that we will want to ask you some questions.

Dr. SCHOENING. The committee might perhaps be interested in a little background on research on foot-and-mouth disease with particular reference to the interest of the Bureau of Animal Industry over the years.

The Bureau, of course, has been dedicated to the eradication of the disease by the stamping-out method which has been successful in all of the invasions with foot-and-mouth disease that we have had in this country up to date. At the same time, the Department, through the Bureau of Animal Industry, has been much interested in the research that has been going on in the various countries of the world over the years in order to keep abreast of the situation and be in a position to

take advantage of any research that might throw light on other means of controlling and eradicating foot-and-mouth disease should it appear in the United States.

Up until 1925 this interest was expressed through visits from time to time of members of the Department in Europe, in countries where the disease was endemic, and through close contact with the literature and with scientists from abroad who had visited the Department from time to time.

Following the outbreak of the foot-and-mouth disease in California in 1924, the Department, through the Bureau of Animal Industry, organized a commission to study foot-and-mouth disease in Europe. I think Dr. Traum, who was a member of this Commission, appeared before you yesterday. The other two members of the Commission were Dr. Peter K. Olitzky, of the Rockefeller Institute for Medical Research, and myself, representing the Department of Agriculture.

The Commission spent 1 year in Europe visiting the various countries where foot-and-mouth disease was being studied from a research standpoint, and the Commission did some research at the Institute of Hygiene in Strasbourg. Much information was obtained on the nature of the disease, not only through the contacts with workers in the various countries but also through actual experimentation with the disease itself.

I might say, incidentally, I think perhaps that is the only way to really become thoroughly familiar with the disease in its various aspects, by actual experimental work. The Commission returned to the United States in 1926 and the interest since that time has been confined to visiting countries from time to time where the disease has been present. I had the opportunity to make several recent visits to Europe myself, the last one being this past year from September to November, a matter of about 4 to 5 weeks, and had the opportunity to talk with the various men who were engaged in foot-and-mouth-disease research and to see some of the institutions that were in operation. In the past the Department has felt that due to the geographical location of the United States and the extent of foot-and-mouth disease in years past that this country was fairly well protected from the introduction of the disease due to its natural barriers of the oceans and through its regulatory efforts to keep out materials which might bring in the infection. However, the world is getting smaller. We now have the outbreak of foot-and-mouth disease in Mexico, which brings the disease very much closer to the borders of the United States than it ever has been before. Until the disease is eradicated in Mexico, it will be a threat at our doorstep continually.

It has been the experience in European countries that when a neighboring country has the disease, in spite of the efforts that are made to control it, it eventually crosses the boundaries and the usual story has been when these waves of infection occur that it spreads from one country to another.

Recognizing the potential threat or the direct threat of foot-and-mouth disease to this country by its appearance in Mexico, it is felt that some action should be taken to prepare ourselves in the event that the disease is introduced into the country and not wait until the house is on fire but try to prevent the fire from occurring by developing the necessary information which it would be necessary to have in order to

bolster up our defense and our control measures should the disease occur in this country. For that reason we think it is quite advisable and desirable that a long-range program on research be started in the United States under United States jurisdiction which would have the advantage of a long-time program in which we might develop some of the answers that very probably would be needed.

I think, Mr. Chairman, as a preliminary statement, perhaps that would be sufficient.

Mr. GILLIE. Now, about all we know, then, about foot-and-mouth disease, I mean as far as the study of it is concerned, is when we send our scientists abroad to study it over there; is that right?

Dr. SCHOENING. That is right, or has been in the past. The visits abroad of our scientists have been of a temporary nature. They have not been a continuing proposition. So that the information obtained was as of that particular time and not carried any further.

Mr. GILLIE. In view of the fact that the foot-and-mouth disease is so close to this country, and we, of course, realize the importance or the terribleness of the disease, what is the possible chance of renewing our old program with Mexico, I mean the first program we had? Is there any possible chance of renewing that and carrying it on?

Dr. SCHOENING. Well, there is a possible chance, but, as I understand the situation, it is a long way off.

Mr. GILLIE. Do you mean a year or 2 years?

Dr. SCHOENING. Oh, no; more than that. I would say 5 or 10 years, possibly.

Mr. GILLIE. Of course, the foot-and-mouth disease could probably do a lot of damage in that time. Do you feel that it is absolutely necessary that something be done to increase the protection in this country from foot-and-mouth disease now?

Dr. SCHOENING. Yes, I do.

Mr. GILLIE. You think it is absolutely necessary?

Dr. SCHOENING. I think so.

Mr. GILLIE. Mr. Worley?

Mr. WORLEY. Doctor, how long have you been with the Bureau of Animal Industry?

Dr. SCHOENING. I entered the BAI in 1907. I have had continuous service since that time.

Mr. WORLEY. During that time there have been several outbreaks of foot-and-mouth disease in the United States?

Dr. SCHOENING. Yes, sir.

Mr. WORLEY. I understand the slaughter-and-burial method was followed.

Dr. SCHOENING. Yes, sir.

Mr. WORLEY. Was there any disposition at that time to do any research to find a cure for foot-and-mouth disease?

Dr. SCHOENING. Well, following the outbreak of 1924, this Commission I spoke of was established to study the disease in Europe and also do research. I think that was perhaps the first concerted effort or definite effort.

Mr. WORLEY. Do you have any authority at this time to conduct research on foot-and-mouth disease virus?

Dr. SCHOENING. Well, our authority is very broad. We operate in the Bureau under the diseases-of-animals appropriation, which allows

us to work with most any disease that exists in the United States. So far as working with foot-and-mouth disease in the United States, we would have, of course, to have authority to bring that virus in.

Mr. WORLEY. You do not have that authority? Is there any prohibition against such importation?

Dr. SCHOENING. I think it is probably a regulation, as near as I can understand. I am not too sure about that, though.

Mr. WORLEY. Issued by whom?

Dr. SCHOENING. By the Secretary of Agriculture.

Mr. WORLEY. Then he could modify or remand the regulation?

Dr. SCHOENING. Yes.

Mr. WORLEY. Why has he seen fit, if he has, to issue such a regulation?

Dr. SCHOENING. I think it is to prevent the importation of viruses into this country except under proper supervision. I might say in explanation of that that provisions are made for the importation of viruses into the United States on license which is issued by the Bureau of Animal Industry.

Mr. WORLEY. The license?

Dr. SCHOENING. Yes.

Mr. WORLEY. You mean for the importation of the virus as such, not as a part of animals?

Dr. SCHOENING. That is right. A virus. Say, fowl-plague virus could be brought in under this permit, the permit system.

Mr. WORLEY. I wonder if you can provide the committee or have your legal counsel provide the committee with a copy of any prohibition which you think would keep your Department from experimenting or doing research with the foot-and-mouth virus or rinderpest.

Dr. SCHOENING. Yes.

Mr. WORLEY. During your visits abroad and your long experience with the foot-and-mouth problem, did you find any country which deliberately imported the virus where the disease did not already exist?

Dr. SCHOENING. Well, the countries that are conducting research and have over the years have been countries where the disease has been present at some time or other.

Mr. WORLEY. And they began experimenting or research after the disease broke out?

Dr. SCHOENING. I would think perhaps England would be the nearest country to answering your specific question. I think you are familiar, perhaps, with the system used in England, which is similar to ours. They stamp out the disease through the slaughter policy and for varying periods they are free of the disease. Now, the disease may be introduced again. They may be free for 6 months and have an outbreak after that time.

Mr. WORLEY. But it would be safe to say that you know of no country which deliberately imported a virus for the purpose of research until the disease had broken out?

Dr. SCHOENING. There are very few countries in the world that are in the same position as the United States. That is, a country that is free of foot-and-mouth disease. There are very few of them.

Mr. WORLEY. And this country is one?

Dr. SCHOENING. This country is one. Canada is another.

Mr. WORLEY. Heretofore we have always followed the policy, whether by law or by regulation, of keeping the virus out regardless for what purpose it was desired to bring it in; is that correct?

Dr. SCHOENING. That is correct.

Mr. WORLEY. That policy seems to have been at least reasonably successful, does it not, Doctor?

Dr. SCHOENING. I did not quite get that.

Mr. WORLEY. I say, has that policy not been reasonably successful?

Dr. SCHOENING. Yes; it has.

Mr. WORLEY. If you propose at this time, because Mexico has it, to change that policy and bring in the virus, what objection would you have to setting up such a bureau or laboratory in Mexico as you would like to set up here?

Dr. SCHOENING. Well, one of the principal objections would be the fact that the United States would not have complete control over the operations within the confines of the unit.

Mr. WORLEY. How do you justify that statement, Doctor? Has the Mexican Government said that we would not have control?

Dr. SCHOENING. No; but I think that if a laboratory were established in Mexico, it would be on a cooperative basis with the Mexican Government. I mean, the Mexican Government would be in it 50-50.

Mr. WORLEY. Would that necessarily follow?

Dr. SCHOENING. No; it would not. Usually it is much like two families living in a house. They get along very well but there may be some things that one family wants to do that the other family perhaps might not think would be the right thing to do.

Mr. WORLEY. That would be a subject of negotiations between our State and Agricultural Departments and Mexico, would it not?

Dr. SCHOENING. That is right.

Mr. WORLEY. So your assumption that we would not have control is not necessarily well founded, is it?

Dr. SCHOENING. Well, just on that basis from my own observations in foreign countries, I would think that.

Mr. WORLEY. Well, now, we have an Embassy down in Mexico and they have one up here which they run and control. They have complete and full control and jurisdiction over it. Frankly, I think Mexico would be tickled to death to give us complete control of any laboratory we set up down there. After all, we are providing a good deal of the money in the foot-and-mouth fight.

Dr. SCHOENING. Well, that is only one reason.

Mr. WORLEY. What are your other objections?

Dr. SCHOENING. Well, the other is the fact that when you establish a laboratory in a country where the disease is endemic, you have difficulties, perhaps, in getting your susceptible animals into that area where your laboratory is located.

Mr. WORLEY. Would that be true in Mexico where it seems to be prevalent over a pretty wide geographical area?

Dr. SCHOENING. Yes; I think it would. By susceptible animals, I mean animals that have not had the disease.

Mr. WORLEY. Then wouldn't have you the same difficulty up here?

Dr. SCHOENING. No; our animals are susceptible to the disease up here.

Mr. WORLEY. But you are talking about the animal that is already infected. If you would have difficulty getting the animal in Mexico where the disease exists, how much more trouble would you have getting it up here.

Dr. SCHOENING. No; when I say a susceptible animal, I do not mean an infected animal or a diseased animal, I mean a normal animal, one which has not had any exposure whatsoever to the disease. Now, such an animal is absolutely necessary for experimentation with the virus of foot-and-mouth disease.

Mr. WORLEY. You mean a healthy, normal animal that has not had contact with the virus?

All right. If our facts are correct, within the northern area of Mexico there are several hundred thousand head. You should have no difficulty in getting them.

Dr. SCHOENING. Your big difficulty would be getting those animals into the place where your experimentation is going on without their coming in contact with any infected material.

Mr. GILLIE. Will the gentleman yield right there?

Mr. WORLEY. Yes.

Mr. GILLIE. Is it not our understanding now that the Mexican Government has set up a research station or laboratory of their own, that they want one of their own? Is that not true?

Dr. SCHOENING. I think they are proposing to; yes. I do not know just what they are doing about it.

Mr. GILLIE. I am not sure whether I am correct on that, but it is my impression that they want to set up one of their own, not in conjunction with any other country.

Dr. SCHOENING. They propose to do research work in Mexico. The Mexican people do.

Mr. WORLEY. What is your next objection, doctor?

Dr. SCHOENING. I think that is the real heavy objection. That is one of the most important things from the standpoint of research on the foot-and-mouth disease. Now, of course, many of these countries that do have foot-and-mouth disease do research and they do the best they can in getting susceptible animals. They have some difficulty, many times. That does hamper their research work and puts qualifications on what they find. They simply define it under the conditions of experiment. Now, perhaps that might be translated to a country where the disease is present but it might be quite hazardous to take those same results and translate them to cattle in the United States or in the uninfected area of Mexico. That is the great difficulty.

Mr. WORLEY. You do not think you could fly them from the United States to Mexico?

Dr. SCHOENING. Cattle?

Mr. WORLEY. Yes. That would lessen the possibility.

Dr. SCHOENING. Well, that is possible. Of course, you would have to take all your feed in and everything else would have to go in. That probably could be done, but it would be quite a cumbersome job and over a long range, with large numbers of animals, it would be extremely costly just from the transportation standpoint.

Mr. WORLEY. What are your other objections, Doctor?

Dr. SCHOENING. I think that is about it. From an experimental standpoint, I would stress the success of any venture in the experimentation on the foot-and-mouth disease as dependent largely on the susceptibility of your animals.

Mr. WORLEY. That is all, thank you, doctor.

Mr. BRAMBLETT. Doctor, we have sent at various times delegations to South America, have we not, to check on their experiments and the conditions down there? Have we not sent them a variety of times over your period of time in the BAI? What has been the result of those?

Dr. SCHOENING. Well, as far as I know, there has been no scientific investigation of any of the—you are speaking particularly of foot-and-mouth disease?

Mr. BRAMBLETT. Have any of these expeditions that have been sent down there—I remember one sent clear down into Patagonia, I believe, and for some reason or other no one has ever been able to see the report. Maybe it is out now. I have never seen it, but I have heard something to that effect.

Dr. SCHOENING. I think that had more to do with the presence of the disease in certain parts of South America.

Mr. BRAMBLETT. They must have brought back to us some information on the disease that would be helpful.

Dr. SCHOENING. Well, I think it was more from the standpoint of the importation of animals from South America, as I recall. I am not very familiar with that particular thing.

Mr. GILLIE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BRAMBLETT. Yes.

Mr. GILLIE. I think that expedition was made in connection with the Argentine people shipping meat into this country, was it not?

There was some question as to whether they were allowed to ship meat into this country and the group went down there to find out whether the disease had been present in that particular locality.

Dr. SCHOENING. I think that was it. It was more to determine the presence of the disease in certain parts of South America as a basis for determining whether meats could be imported from those countries.

Mr. BRAMBLETT. Of course we have had some delegations down in Brazil not too far in the past, have we not, to participate in their experiments?

Dr. SCHOENING. Not from the Bureau of Animal Industry, as I know.

Mr. BRAMBLETT. Do you know of any expeditions into South America at all, to participate in their research or to check on what they have done?

Dr. SCHOENING. No. As far as I know, that has not been accomplished.

Mr. BRAMBLETT. Is there any good reason that you know of why we have not continuously participated with some of these nations in their research, or, at least, as observers?

Dr. SCHOENING. No; there is no particular reason why that should not have been done. I think perhaps the Department felt that through occasional visits and contacts with the literature and the contacts with visiting scientists from abroad that we were sufficiently

familiar with what was actually going on to be abreast of the times and abreast of the trend of research.

Mr. BRAMBLETT. Did I understand you or did I misunderstand you, Doctor, when you said that the disease in Mexico was endemic?

Dr. SCHOENING. Yes.

Mr. BRAMBLETT. Do you believe that the disease in Mexico now is endemic?

Dr. SCHOENING. Yes; in certain sections of it.

Mr. BRAMBLETT. You have brought up a point about neighboring countries having the disease when the other country alongside had it. Would you say that that is also the case in England, where the disease, according to our testimony yesterday, is not endemic? Would that cause the outbreaks in England, also, as a neighboring country of France or Holland or Germany?

Dr. SCHOENING. Of course England is separated from the continent, and I think that most of their outbreaks, as I understand the situation in England, have been brought about through the feeding of swill or garbage from infected meats from South American countries. Then introductions are on a different basis than the introductions in continental Europe, from one country to another.

Mr. BRAMBLETT. Do you think we should take more adequate measures to protect this country from the garbage and swill situation that develops in the transportation on ships and in the handling coming into our territory?

Dr. SCHOENING. Well, I think things are pretty well taken care of there. I think that is a very important point to stress, but I think the Bureau, through its inspection and quarantine division, has done pretty well on that.

Mr. BRAMBLETT. The Bureau definitely traced the 1929 outbreak around Los Angeles to that garbage from foreign ships, did it not?

Dr. SCHOENING. Yes.

Mr. BRAMBLETT. Just one other question, Doctor.

Would you have any objection to the establishment of this laboratory and experimental station outside the continental United States if we have complete jurisdiction, and also have a condition where people are glad to live, and including these other yardsticks that have been set up—the measurement seems to follow—or do you insist on a continental United States laboratory?

Mr. SCHOENING. No; I would have no objection to having it outside of the continental United States, from one standpoint. However, I would call attention to this point: In this proposed set-up, as we see it—this research set-up—we visualize it on a sufficiently large scale that the results would be quite productive within a reasonably short time. We also visualize that the best scientific help possible would be engaged in this project in order to be commensurate with the physical plant as we see it and utilize that plant to its proper facilities.

Now, in order to have such a staff it may be necessary that your location be such that you can command the services of the people that you think should be engaged in this operation and also the staff should have sufficient facilities for contact with their fellow scientists and other institutions to make the work productive.

If a unit were placed outside of the continental United States, which might be satisfactory from most every other standpoint, you might still have the big factor of getting the proper personnel to go to this particular place.

Mr. BRAMBLETT. Yes. But, at the same time, Doctor, you might have to, for instance, if you wanted to get in touch with Dr. Traum out in Berkeley, Calif., and that is 3,000 miles or more from a so-called nearby Long Island installation, a whole lot farther than Puerto Rico, as far as the situation is concerned. You are going to have some difficulties in any spot you go to, but I understand you right that, in general, if the most serious objections are taken care of you have no personal objection to having it outside the continental United States, from the standpoint of location?

Mr. SCHOENING. That is right. But I would qualify that by saying that the possible difficulty in getting the proper personnel to go outside of the continental United States might be so great as to make the whole thing impracticable from the standpoint of putting it outside the continental United States, particularly to meet the objective that would be set up.

Mr. BRAMBLETT. And yet I do not know of any trouble we had getting top qualified men to go to Mexico City. They were glad to go down there, and seemingly, when I was there, they were happy there in their situation. As a matter of fact, they indicated that if we would just leave them alone they would take care of the situation. That was the impression that I got. I do not see why we should anticipate that you would have any more trouble getting top qualified men to go to some good spot outside of the continental United States to work over a period of years. That is part of their work. I mean, they do that. You went to Europe and Dr. Traum went and worked in Germany after the war with two or three others. Dr. Shope was up on an island, which, to my notion, would be a whole lot worse condition than many others we could get. I think the difficulties can be overcome, as far as getting the qualified personnel to go is concerned. There are many locations outside the continental United States, and perhaps you would get just as much results.

I would like to ask you one more question about the vaccine which I asked Dr. Shope. I would like to get your reaction to it.

Do you feel that any research program will simply develop a vaccine which will have to be used over and over, time after time, as far as foot-and-mouth disease is concerned?

Dr. SCHOENING. I do not quite get your point.

Mr. BRAMBLETT. At the present time, thinking of the fatality situation as far as rinderpest is concerned, and then thinking about the fatality situation as far as foot-and-mouth disease is concerned, which is a small percentage, and the point that was brought out that it is only over a period of 6 months to a year, or a little over, that you are able to get the immunity, either by vaccine or by actually having the disease, would that be the first objective of the research—to develop a vaccine which would only take care of it for a number of months and it would be a continuous vaccine problem?

Mr. SCHOENING. No, the plan would be to develop the best possible vaccine which would give the longest possible immunity. While a certain amount of progress has been made in the development of vac-

cines against foot-and-mouth disease, the field is still wide open and there are plenty of prospects for improving them.

Mr. BRAMBLETT. You feel that we might even get a vaccine that would give complete immunity?

Dr. SCHOENING. Yes, I think there is a possibility.

Mr. GILLIE. Mr. Worley.

Mr. WORLEY. Do you not think it would be cheaper and just as productive for this country to cooperate with other countries which are already experimenting, and have been experimenting for years, rather than to set up our own laboratory in the United States and take a chance on spreading the virus?

Dr. SCHOENING. You say cheaper?

Mr. WORLEY. Cheaper and just as productive. Have you given any thought to that?

Dr. SCHOENING. Yes. Of course we feel, for the reasons that I have indicated before, that it would very probably be more productive if a unit were set up somewhere where the disease was not present, for the reason that you could get these materials, and animals and feed and so on, without danger of contamination.

Mr. WORLEY. Do you know whether England has experienced difficulties along that line?

Dr. SCHOENING. No; I do not think so because they are practically free of the disease all the time except for these occasional outbreaks that they have, and they are immediately stamped out.

Mr. WORLEY. Well, would it not be desirable for us to work with England?

Dr. SCHOENING. Well, I do not see any objection, from our standpoint.

Mr. WORLEY. We have been working with them for quite some time now.

Mr. SCHOENING. Yes. Now, whether the English would want to work with us on a long-time basis, we do not know. I doubt very much that their facilities would lend themselves to a long-time program, as we visualize it, without perhaps setting up a whole new unit in some other part of the country.

Mr. WORLEY. That is all. Thank you.

Mr. GILLIE. Gentlemen, it is a quarter after 12 now. We will adjourn. We have permission from the Speaker to carry on this committee hearing this afternoon, so we will call the committee to order again at 1:30.

(Whereupon, at 12:20 p. m., the committee recessed until 1:30 p. m. of the same day.)

AFTERNOON SESSION

Mr. GILLIE. The committee will come to order. We would like to have Dr. Schoening return to the witness stand.

Now, Mr. Heimburger has some questions he would like to ask you.

FURTHER STATEMENT OF DR. SCHOENING

Mr. HEIMBURGER. Dr. Schoening, I would just like to get a little clearer, if I could, some of the reasons why the Department feels it needs special authorization for this study of foot-and-mouth disease,

for this experimenting in the United States. I think you replied in answer to Mr. Worley this morning that the authority of the Bureau to conduct experimental research—basic research in animal diseases—was rather broad, and that certainly coincides with what I have been able to find out in the statute books about it.

You have been conducting basic research in animal diseases, have you not?

Dr. SCHOENING. That is right.

Mr. HELMBURGER. What major diseases are you conducting experimental work on now, Doctor?

Dr. SCHOENING. Well, we are working on all of the virus diseases, more or less intensively, equine encephalomyelitis, hog cholera, the Newcastle disease of poultry, the poxes of poultry, the vesicular diseases of horses and cattle, and we are working in the bacterial diseases such as brucellosis, anthrax, pullorum disease of poultry.

In other words, we have authority and we do work at various times on many or all of the diseases that do exist in the United States at some time or other.

We are working more intensively on some projects that we do not have the answers to, from a control standpoint. Some of the diseases that we have worked on have had control measures developed which are fairly satisfactory in eliminating or reducing the losses caused by those diseases. We pay particular attention to those diseases about which we do not have sufficient information to put into effect adequate control measures.

Mr. HELMBURGER. Where do you carry on this experimentation? Do you have a laboratory?

Dr. SCHOENING. We have a laboratory in Washington, here in the city, and we have a laboratory at Beltsville at the animal-disease station.

Now, the work on the infectious and noninfectious diseases is carried on at those two places.

Then we have some branch laboratories in different parts of the country. There is one in Chicago, one in Denver, one at Ames, Iowa, and a poison plant station at Salina, Utah.

Mr. HELMBURGER. The personnel of the Bureau have also done some work in foreign countries, have they not? I think you mentioned that some of the personnel had from time to time gone to foot-and-mouth disease laboratories in Europe and had done some work there.

Dr. SCHOENING. That is right.

Mr. HELMBURGER. Do you not feel that if the Department wanted to go ahead on this foot-and-mouth disease, and if the Appropriations Committee gave them money, that you could go ahead and do it without special legislation?

Dr. SCHOENING. Yes, I think so. I do not think we need legislation to embark in research on foot-and-mouth disease. We would, however, need funds.

Dr. HELMBURGER. There was just one other question I wanted to ask you, and I don't know whether you are prepared to answer it or not: In this bill as introduced, there is also authorization for carrying on this experimental work under section 10 (a) of the Bankhead-Jones Act of 1935, as amended by the Research Marketing Act of 1946. Do you know what the purpose of that was?

That section, 10 (a) of the Bankhead-Jones Act, is the section which permits the letting out of the contracts for research work not only to State institutions, but to private individuals and institutions that are qualified. Do you know what part of this foot-and-mouth disease research work it was contemplated might be carried on under this arrangement?

Dr. SCHOENING. I think the idea was that it might be feasible at some time or other to have a laboratory do a certain amount of research work, perhaps utilizing only small animals, or perhaps utilizing only the laboratory techniques.

Mr. HELMBURGER. So that some of the work might be carried on outside this central laboratory that you contemplate setting up; is that correct?

Dr. SCHOENING. That would give authority for that idea. Now, of course, any provisions that would be made along that line would be contingent upon these laboratories meeting the most stringent requirements to prevent the escape of the virus, and unless these facilities were available permission would not be given to embark in any activity.

Mr. HELMBURGER. I certainly did not mean to intimate that the Bureau would be careless in that sort of thing. I just wanted to point out that the language of the bill is rather broad in that respect, and would authorize that sort of thing.

That is all the questions I have, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. GILLIE. To make the point that you brought out this morning a little clearer, I would like to ask you again whether the possibilities of the dissemination of this disease from any laboratory that we may set up are great or quite remote. I do not think that was quite clear this morning.

Dr. SCHOENING. Well, there was some discussion about that point this morning, and in order to clarify that point I would like to make this statement, that the point has been raised this morning about the danger of the virus escaping from a laboratory should it be set up in this country, and defeat the very purpose for which the laboratory is set up. We feel in viewing the situation that the danger of the introduction of the virus from Mexico would be far greater than the danger of the escape of the virus from a laboratory. We visualize in the set-up of this laboratory that all the precautions that are absolutely necessary to insure the utmost safety so that the virus does not escape must be followed through. That is a very basic requirement in the set-up of this laboratory as the Department visualizes it.

Unless all of those requirements are made available, I for one would not want to be associated with any work on foot-and-mouth disease in this country. We realize the responsibility that rests when we do work with foot-and-mouth disease in this country. We want to be assured that we have the facilities that we think are necessary, and I might say, incidentally, that this will cost money in order to set up these facilities in proper shape.

These facilities must be set up from two angles, one to prevent the escape of the virus from the confines of the institute, and, secondly, the set-up must be such that work can be performed inside the units of the laboratory so that such different types of experimentation can go on without the danger of accidental escape of the infection from one unit inside the compound to another. In other words, there would be

no escape of the virus outside of the confines, but it is absolutely necessary for the experimental work to proceed on such a basis that certain types of experimentation can be carried on without danger of one experiment interfering with another.

Mr. BRAMBLETT. Dr. Schoening, in listening to your answers to the questions a minute ago, I think I am confused again. I cannot see any use in having the bill. It seems to me that you need to go to the Appropriations Committee for an appropriation. I cannot see any reason for the bill if you have all the authority.

Can you straighten me out a little bit on that? This bill is not for an appropriation. If all the authority is already present in the law, and you already have the authority, I do not know why you are bringing up the bill. It just leaves me confused again.

Dr. SCHOENING. Well, I am not too sure whether I can——

Mr. BRAMBLETT. You understand the point I am making?

Dr. SCHOENING. Yes, I do. I think perhaps the thought was that this is such a marked departure from what has taken place in the past that perhaps it would strengthen the support if the Department was authorized to actually set up these laboratories, or a laboratory.

Mr. BRAMBLETT. You mean, in other words, that this is an opportunity to notify the people who are interested in the foot-and-mouth disease from a variety of angles of the contemplation of the BAI and the Department of Agriculture to set up research facilities in this country and give them an opportunity to come before a public group and express their thinking on the matter. Is that what you mean?

Dr. SCHOENING. I think so. I think that was the background.

Mr. GILLIE. You made a statement a little while ago about one of your facilities being in Chicago, another in Iowa, and what was the one you had in Utah?

Dr. SCHOENING. In Utah?

Mr. GILLIE. Yes.

Dr. SCHOENING. That is a laboratory located on the Fish Lake National Forest, a small unit that investigates the effects of poisonous plants on livestock just in that area.

Mr. GILLIE. Thank you.

Mr. GRANGER. A moment or so ago you said this was going to be a costly program. Have you made any estimates as to how much the facilities, themselves, might cost?

Dr. SCHOENING. Well, only very roughly. We visualize that this may cost in the neighborhood of \$20,000,000, perhaps a little less or a little more.

Mr. GRANGER. And then you said further that because of the fact that it was a departure from what you had done, and in view of the public sentiment as to the foot-and-mouth disease, that rather than go ahead on your own you would sooner have the Congress of the United States authorize you to proceed?

Dr. SCHOENING. Yes.

Mr. GRANGER. I think that is a wise thing to do.

Mr. WORLEY. Did you say this morning that you had not fully explored the possibility of cooperating with some other country outside the continental limits of the United States.

Dr. SCHOENING. No, I do not believe I mentioned that point at all.

Mr. WORLEY. I thought I asked you about the cooperation with other countries.

Dr. SCHOENING. I think perhaps on a temporary basis cooperation could be set up with some of the countries.

Mr. WORLEY. Do you suppose it would be advisable to go into that possibility and see if it could be done at less cost than \$20,000,000, and at the same time have a reasonable chance of being as successful as a laboratory you would set up here in the United States?

Dr. SCHOENING. Well, we think perhaps on a temporary basis that might be advisable. As a matter of fact, that is contemplated in the immediate program, pending the development of the long-range program, if it is approved. That would take some time. In the meantime, the immediate program would be predicated on an effort to assist in the control of the disease in Mexico, and at the same time familiarize some of our men with the problems of research on foot-and-mouth disease as they might be conducted in these other laboratories.

Mr. WORLEY. You speak of the long-range program, Doctor. I understand that many nations have spent years and years trying to find a cure or a successful vaccine for foot-and-mouth disease. In view of all of that experimentation, do you not suppose it is quite possible, perhaps probable, that a cure could be found almost any day now?

Dr. SCHOENING. You mean it might be developed in the European countries?

Mr. WORLEY. Or wherever they are carrying on experiments.

Dr. SCHOENING. Well, I might say in that connection a research on foot-and-mouth disease, regardless of where it is carried out, is an extremely costly and laborious proposition. It takes a long time. You have to use large animals, and you have got to have certain facilities to prevent the escape of infection.

I might say even in those countries years ago where the disease was under research that these countries took extreme precautions to prevent the escape of infection.

In the early days of the research work in Germany, particularly, this research was supported partly by the fact that the institutions had something to sell. On the island where the Germans did their research, which was perhaps one of the largest research stations established in Germany, in the early days they prepared a serum which gave protection for only a matter of days. It was the best that was available at that time, and it did some good.

Now, this product was sold by the unit. It was a governmental institution on this island. Much of the revenue that was derived from the sale of this product went back into research. They were able over the years to do quite a fair amount of research.

Now, the same thing prevails in some of the other European countries where they are making vaccine at the present time. They are selling this vaccine. The revenue has to support what little research they can do.

Now, with their activities in vaccine production, the physical plants are small and the actual amount of research that they can accomplish in a reasonable length of time is also correspondingly small. That has been the situation over the years with foot-and-mouth disease.

I might say, incidentally, that in my opinion this is one of the most difficult problems of research that I think one can engage in. That is

because, first, of the extremely infectious nature of the infective agent, and the fact that most of the work in the final analysis will have to be done on large animals, which requires considerable space for holding, considerable space for various studies on immunity. All this time you have to take the most stringent precautions to keep the disease in its confines because of the highly infectious nature of it. It is much more infectious than rinderpest. It is also much more difficult to work with from that standpoint.

We have so many other complicating factors in the study of foot-and-mouth disease that are not so apparent with some of the other diseases. I refer particularly to the fact that there are three types, at least, of virus in foot-and-mouth disease. Each one of those types is immunologically distinct from the other. With rinderpest, as far as we know, we only have the one type of virus. Those things complicate this whole matter of research and make progress slow. It is a very broad and very difficult problem, and in order to attack the problem from a sufficient number of angles so that results can be expected in a matter of a few years, a physical plan to meet those requirements must be had. In other words, are we going to work for 10 years intensively to get an answer, or are we going to work 50 or 60 or 70 years to get the same answer.

Mr. WORLEY. Well, on that point, could you not take advantage of the work that has already been done in other countries? Could you not take advantage of all the laboratory facilities that they have?

Dr. SCHOENING. Well, they do not have the laboratory facilities, really, to engage in any extensive work. Probably the station at Pirbright, England, is the largest unit.

Mr. WORLEY. Is that the best equipped one that you know of?

Dr. SCHOENING. Yes, they are engaged purely in research, whereas the other laboratories are engaged in the production of vaccine and also some production of serum.

Mr. GILLIE. Very well, Doctor. We thank you very much for coming before this committee and helping us out.

The next witness will be Dr. Shahan. Dr. Shahan has had charge of the foot-and-mouth work in Mexico. He has had quite a lot of experiences as I understand.

Dr. Shahan, will you give your name to the reporter, please?

STATEMENT OF DR. M. S. SHAHAN, VETERINARIAN, BUREAU OF ANIMAL INDUSTRY

Mr. SHAHAN. My name is Maurice S. Shahan, veterinarian in the Bureau of Animal Industry. I am assigned to the cooperative project in Mexico. My title on that commission is codirector, working opposite a Mexican director.

Mr. GILLIE. Dr. Shahan, you have been in Mexico and had charge of the work down there. Understand you have been there about a year and have had a lot of experience, some of it good and some not quite so good. I wish you would tell us in your own words the progress of the work in Mexico. We would like to know what has happened down there, and how far we are going to go in eradication work, and what are the possibilities of cleaning it up.

Mr. SHAHAN. Possibly a little review, a brief review of the course of events, would be helpful.

It may help to explain some of the problems and difficulties that have been encountered. In the first place, the disease which apparently first occurred in Mexico in November of 1946 was not officially so diagnosed until late in December of 1946. In the meantime, the facilities of the Mexican Government alone had been inadequate to control the spread of the disease, and in January of 1947 the disease was already existent in at least six Mexican States and the Federal district.

At the time we became organized for cooperative work, and entered Mexico on a cooperative basis, the disease had spread to approximately a half dozen additional States.

Up to the present time the disease has been diagnosed in 16 Mexican States and the Federal district. It is an area involving more than a third of the total area of Mexico, and more than a third of its total livestock population.

With all the facilities that we had we pursued the campaign in Mexico through an agreement with the Mexican Government on a basis of outright eradication such as had been successfully pursued previously in the United States. With the progress of the campaign it became evident to the Mexican people and the Mexican Government that the problem was overwhelming and that it could not be accomplished in that way. Therefore, the Mexican section of the Joint Commission proposed that the program be modified to incorporate certain control measures such as vaccination, which had not been used originally. The American section, in view of the developments that had taken place, agreed to the proposed modification. There was an agreement between the two Governments to that effect.

I may say that as far as we of the American section of the Commission are concerned, we feel that the position in Mexico is now such that we must regard Mexico as being endemically bound by foot-and-mouth disease. The disease has become established in Mexico.

MR. GILLIE. Permanently, do you think?

MR. SHAHAN. We hope not permanently, but there is certainly no immediate prospect of eradication. Fortright wholesale eradication such as was contemplated and practiced to the extent possible originally would not, in my opinion, be tolerable to the Mexican people at all. We feel that we are faced with the problem of controlling the disease until such time as eradication may become possible through some presently unforeseen development.

I think one of the first considerations in a long-time research project is the permanency of that establishment.

MR. WORLEY. On that point, what is your conception or definition of a long time?

DR. SHAHAN. A matter of decades.

MR. WORLEY. Until what happens? Until you find a cure?

DR. SHAHAN. Until you have all the weapons at hand for the successful control or combat of that disease.

MR. WORLEY. Do you think that might be 50 years or 100 years?

DR. SHAHAN. Conceivably so.

MR. WORLEY. Conceivably could it not be also 1 year?

DR. SHAHAN. I do not believe all the problems you want to solve can be solved in 1 year, even with a good set-up.

Mr. WORLEY. You have two problems, one a cure and one a preventive. Is it probable that you could find them within a year?

Dr. SHAHAN. I would say it was possible but highly improbable.

Mr. WORLEY. Would you say it would be probable within a 10-year period?

Dr. SHAHAN. I do not know. It is a very difficult thing to estimate time when you are conducting biologic research.

Mr. WORLEY. Assuming that you had all the necessary facilities and resources available, could you not find a cure or predict success or failure within 10 years?

Dr. SHAHAN. Well, I would certainly have very strong hopes that in a good set-up you could accomplish a great deal in a 10-year period, if you had completely adequate facilities, and if the facilities are under the direction of one government so that your primary arrangements are not upset by anything that happens in the other country. You would be governed solely by what goes on in your own country.

I think that a 10-year program should certainly provide some very useful information. Whether that would be the end solution, or not, I think would be problematical.

Mr. WORLEY. Then your assumption that it might go on for years and years is subject to the qualifications you just made.

Your second point, you assume that you might be under the control of two governments. Why do you say that you would not be under the complete control of the United States?

Dr. SHAHAN. I think, generally speaking, if one country goes to work in another country there has to be a cooperative agreement between the two countries.

Mr. WORLEY. Don't you suppose that an agreement could be reached with Mexico, and, if not, why not?

Dr. SHAHAN. The agreement, of course, might be reached with Mexico as well as any other country, but if you establish the facilities in Mexico you do have the problems which have been outlined by Dr. Schoening and Dr. Galloway and Dr. Traum. Certainly they are inherent difficulties which can be greatly ameliorated by control under one government. You have ready access to your own established institutions of research, and so forth, and a wholly susceptible stock of animals with which to work.

Mr. WORLEY. It is admitted that you would probably encounter difficulties down there that you would not encounter here.

Dr. SHAHAN. Yes.

Mr. WORLEY. But at the same time you would not have the danger down there that you would have here in the importation of the virus. Someone used the phrase "calculated risk" the other day. There is no question in my mind about that, but I think the risk is entirely unwarranted and unjustified under the circumstances.

Mr. GRANGER. Doctor, you had an agreement with Mexico on the present program, did you not?

Dr. SHAHAN. Yes.

Mr. GRANGER. What happened to it?

Dr. SHAHAN. The Mexican Government sought a modification.

Mr. WORLEY. Do you see any connection between that and the establishment of the laboratory?

Dr. SHAHAN. I think the establishment of a laboratory and the conduct of research is going to largely be governed or controlled or affected by those same relationships. You have two governments involved.

Mr. WORLEY. We realize that when you go out and slaughter thousands of cattle and sheep and hogs you are bound to run into protests from the people who raised them. But do you think that is the same as setting up a laboratory that will convince those people that you are trying to do something better, trying to find ways and means other than killing the cattle? Do you think that would cause resentment?

Dr. SHAHAN. Certainly the resentment against slaughter was much greater than should be encountered according to what we believe is public reaction to the modified program of vaccination, and so forth. There should be much less opposition and generally a greater sympathy toward the program.

Mr. WORLEY. What other objections do you have?

Dr. SHAHAN. I think that in the long-term project it is unwise to stray any more than is absolutely necessary from the principle of unity and direction of the research facilities. There would be no question about policy, the course of your experimentation. I think it should be brought out that experimentation on a long-time project must include consideration of other things than vaccines.

It must consider the carrier problem, what animals are carriers, and for how long. In the United States we have always the problem of diagnosis of suspected conditions. They are presented very frequently for differentiation from foot-and-mouth disease. With the present facilities at hand it is most difficult to establish a diagnosis with certainty. If a central research institute were established, those diagnostic facilities would be readily available. We would not have to depend on foreign countries for some of the work that we are not now in a position to do.

Although this country has always been successful in pursuing the policy of outright eradication, it seems only fair to me and only proper that we should consider the possibilities that we may not always be so successful. If we are not successful, if we are not armed with all of the facilities possible in this country, we would be in a much poorer position to eventually eradicate the disease.

That is Mexico's great problem now, that they do not have the facilities which, if they had had them in the beginning, might have helped in the eradication program.

Mr. GRANGER. In the field of research you get to an end in that, do you? There is no end to research, I do not believe. You may stumble along and find the answer to a problem. Now, in cancer and a lot of other things, we have been doing research on them for centuries.

Dr. SHAHAN. Well, the foot-and-mouth disease has been under investigation since 1898. Tuberculosis is still under investigation and cancer. The more you delve into things the more unknown factors you find.

Mr. WORLEY. It seems to me your research is at an end when you find a cure; is it not?

Dr. SHAHAN. But there will undoubtedly be a better cure than the one you have.

Mr. WORLEY. I hope it will be a very effective cure, the best that we can get.

Mr. GRANGER. There would be an end to it; I would not want to say that, but I do not think we should measure what we are talking about here in terms of 10 or 40 or 50 years.

Dr. SHAHAN. It might be brought out that after you conquer one disease history shows that other diseases occur, new diseases in the United States.

One of the new problems in animal and human disease that is presenting itself is Q fever. About that disease practically nothing is known as yet, so that if you have these established facilities for the conduct of research on a disease as difficult to work with as foot-and-mouth disease, there is practically no disease in the animal field that could not be studied in that institute.

Mr. GRANGER. As a matter of fact, if it was not for the theory of this virus getting away from us, I think anyone would agree that the place to do it and the people to do it would be our own people and our own country. It would be the most economical way to do it, and the most satisfactory in every way. If you could satisfy some of these people that you are not going to spread it, I think it would be better.

Dr. SHAHAN. I am not sure that the fact has been brought out, Mr. Granger, in these hearings, that even the most well-established laboratories now existing recognize that their facilities are not quite as good as they would like to have them for the conduct of strictly controlled research.

The outline of the project that the Department has in mind with the aid of qualified advisers envisages a much tighter and more adequate set-up than is presently available any place in the world.

Mr. WORLEY. Are those all of the objections you have for doing this work in Mexico.

Dr. SHAHAN. Yes; I think so. My objections are actually balancing, as I see it, between advantages and disadvantages.

Mr. WORLEY. I am sorry, I did not hear that.

Dr. SHAHAN. My objections are really more in the nature of a weighing of the advantages against disadvantages.

Mr. WORLEY. That is what I am trying to weight in my own mind at the present time.

Mr. GRANGER. It seems to me the gentleman from Texas has been close enough to Mexico in the last 30 years to know that they had their politics down there too and they have some difficult times. I imagine if this laboratory was in the road, they might do something about it. I think that is a lot of chance to take.

Mr. WORLEY. There is no question in my mind but that we can work out, based on my own conversations with Mexican officials on our trip down there, Doctor, perfectly satisfactory agreements with them. Maybe you know more about it, but I certainly do not see the wisdom in taking the chance of bringing this virus into this country. We have had testimony from several witnesses that if it ever gets loose here—of course, that was if we had to live with it—it would cost our economy a billion dollars a year.

Dr. SHAHAN. Well, even if the disease were to get away from the laboratory, the chances of its becoming endemic in the United States are much less than in a country that does not have an adequate and,

established general veterinary police force. In most cases States or counties, as well as the Federal Bureau of Animal Industry, are well organized, and are always on the alert for the appearance of exotic diseases.

MR. WORLEY. I will not argue that with you, but what did the last outbreak cost us?

DR. SHAHAN. Dr. Schoening can probably check that. That was the last outbreak, in 1929. I think it was under \$3,000,000, considerably under that.

MR. WORLEY. That is in the indemnities paid to owners of cattle that had to be slaughtered?

DR. SHAHAN. The total expenses.

MR. WORLEY. You mean that is the total amount?

DR. SHAHAN. Of the last outbreak.

MR. WORLEY. Less than \$3,000,000? Then it might be well to withdraw from Mexico. We could fight the disease for a long time here for less than the \$40,000,000 we have spent down there, couldn't we?

DR. SHAHAN. Well, the added advantage of clean territory in Mexico is definitely a help. If it were to spread clear to the border, we would unquestionably have frequent occurrences of the disease, and it would not be one outbreak, it would be repeated outbreaks.

MR. WORLEY. But \$40,000,000 is a lot of money.

DR. SHAHAN. It would be a very uncomfortable situation.

MR. WORLEY. Do you think you could get by for less than \$3,000,000 in case this disease were to get loose in the United States?

DR. SHAHAN. If it were to get loose?

MR. WORLEY. Yes.

DR. SHAHAN. Oh, my, no; the disease would probably cost hundreds of millions per year if the disease got loose.

MR. WORLEY. But you think we could catch it before it became widespread?

DR. SHAHAN. I think we would have very good chances of stopping it.

Furthermore, under the conditions of the set-up of this laboratory, I believe that the chances of its escape would be very small.

MR. WORLEY. Thank you, Dr. Shahan.

MR. GILLIE. Doctor, on this quarantine they have established in the central part of Mexico, we have heard different stories in connection with the outbreaks that have occurred in that "zero" zone.

DR. SHAHAN. The buffer zone, or protective zone.

MR. GILLIE. How wide is that zone?

DR. SHAHAN. It varies from 30 kilometers to as much as a hundred. In other words, that would be about 25 miles up to 60 or more miles.

MR. GILLIE. Were there any outbreaks? I believe we got some information to the effect that there were some outbreaks above that quarantine zone. Is that right?

DR. SHAHAN. Not above the quarantine line. In the presently constituted buffer zone there were outbreaks in Aguascalientes and Zagatecas. At this time those appear to be under control.

MR. GILLIE. The outbreaks occurred in that buffer zone; and not above the quarantine line.

DR. SHAHAN. Yes.

MR. GILLIE. Were those cattle killed and buried?

Dr. SHAHAN. Eventually the infected cattle were all disposed of.

Mr. GILLIE. About how many were there, have you any idea?

Dr. SHAHAN. I believe in that buffer zone it was less than 10,000 cattle. I cannot be exact on it, although that could be determined.

Mr. GILLIE. There were that many cattle in that zone?

Dr. SHAHAN. That we destroyed, yes.

Mr. GILLIE. Is that since the end of November?

Dr. SHAHAN. Yes. As I say, 10,000 is liberal. We can determine the exact number, but I would not want to state it exactly here.

Mr. GILLIE. Well, somewhere near that?

Dr. SHAHAN. Yes.

Mr. GILLIE. Now, in using the Army to control that line, are you going to have any difficulties with the Army outside of when they have a holiday? They tell me that many soldiers go home on a holiday. Is that right?

Dr. SHAHAN. Well, it is a difficult thing, always, to get people to realize that a quarantine, especially a foot-and-mouth disease quarantine, must be on a 24-hour basis, every man at his post at the designated time and spot. We anticipate that under the conditions in Mexico it will be difficult to maintain that quarantine line on a 24-hour basis, though we have been assured that it would be done.

Mr. GRANGER. Will you yield there, Dr. Gillie?

Is that clear, that this 10,000 cattle in the buffer zone have been since the new program, or during the program?

Mr. GILLIE. I understood you to say since November. Is that right?

Dr. SHAHAN. Yes. It will actually be, I am satisfied, considerably less than 10,000. If you wish, we can determine that figure for you.

Mr. GILLIE. Just how badly this zone was affected is what I was trying to get at and the possibilities of the disease crossing the border.

Dr. SHAHAN. In Aguascalientes and Zacatecas the disease has not been diagnosed for 6 weeks or 2 months.

Mr. GILLIE. That is the place where the outbreaks occurred; is that right?

Dr. SHAHAN. Yes. In addition, in northern Veracruz, along the Gulf coast.

Mr. GILLIE. All of the men that we have had down in central Mexico are on that line now; is that right?

Dr. SHAHAN. They are either on that line or the southern line.

Mr. GILLIE. You do not have any men down around Mexico City or in those areas?

Dr. SHAHAN. We have just a few people remaining there. We are still continuing the replacement of oxen by mules. Those operations are gradually tapering off, and a dead line for pending replacements has been put at March 1, so that those operations will taper off. We do not have inspectors or eradication forces in any of the central area of Mexico. The personnel that is in Mexico City proper is there for administrative work, disinfection, and such activities.

Mr. GILLIE. You still maintain your headquarters in Mexico City?

Dr. SHAHAN. Yes.

Mr. GILLIE. You would not change that?

Dr. SHAHAN. Well, it is conceivable that eventually that might be desirable, but the Mexican officials much prefer to transact business out of Mexico City.

We have moved our district headquarters to a great extent, and they are no longer where they were in the course of our previous program.

Mr. GILLIE. Is there a fear that this disease may cross that line?

Dr. SHAHAN. Constantly. We are constantly aware of that danger.

Mr. GILLIE. Do you have a patrol established on the northern part of that quarantine line, also?

Dr. SHAHAN. We are doing everything in our power to establish such a control. However, it must be pointed out that—and I believe this may be said without fear of contradiction—no country in the world has ever held foot-and-mouth disease completely with a quarantine line alone.

Mr. GILLIE. Do you mean no one has ever held foot-and-mouth disease with a quarantine line. Is that what you said?

Dr. SHAHAN. Yes.

Mr. GILLIE. Do you have any fear that this line is going to break some time?

Dr. SHAHAN. I certainly think it is a constant threat that that line will be penetrated. It is practically impossible to screen absolutely all possible avenues of exit of that virus. I believe we must admit that that threat is constantly present.

Mr. GILLIE. If that is true then we had better be doing something to check this disease northward.

Dr. SHAHAN. Well, I certainly think we must, in the way of research and building our own fortifications, so to speak.

Mr. GILLIE. Now, I want to ask you another question. Probably there are not as many cattle being fed in the northern part of Mexico since this has taken place, and they are being helped to get rid of these cattle through the canning system established there.

What is your idea with reference to carrying on this eradication work down there? Are people in the north more likely to accept this type of work than they are in southern Mexico? I understand they are mostly livestock people in northern Mexico.

Dr. SHAHAN. In the first place, northern Mexican agriculture, or at least the livestock industry, is geared to a program of supply of cattle to the United States, which avenue now being removed has been replaced as best it may be by a canning program. Those people, of course, would have preferred eradication of the disease just as would the people of the United States.

Mr. GILLIE. Well, is it agreed by that group of people in the northern part of Mexico that in case the disease should cross that line they are willing to kill and destroy?

Dr. SHAHAN. That is our understanding, that there would be less difficulty in accomplishing eradication in those northern States than has been encountered in the southern areas. Certainly it is a matter of self-protection for those individuals in those States which are now free of the disease. They understand full well, I believe—that is, the livestock associations and the governors, and so forth—that if they do not wish to have the disease become implanted in their States they will have to undertake immediate eradication measures. That is the understanding that we have with respect to the new program.

Mr. GILLIE. Now, you have been down there a year and you have gotten fairly well acquainted with the people down in Mexico and

what they think of this disease. Do you suppose the way is still open for us to go down there and continue our first program that we started out with? Is there any possible chance of carrying that on later?

Dr. SHAHAN. Frankly, no. I do not believe there is a possibility of resuming an eradication program.

Mr. GILLIE. You do not think that would be possible, to carry that out later on?

Dr. SHAHAN. I think it will have to be accomplished by some other means, if such means are found.

Mr. GRANGER. Will you yield?

Mr. GILLIE. Yes, Mr. Granger.

Mr. GRANGER. What is happening in the Mexican zone? What is happening where we have no jurisdiction?

Dr. SHAHAN. Not having people present in that area, and since the number of Mexican veterinarians in that area is rather limited, we do not have detailed information, but we would suspect that the disease is continuing to spread from the original foci of infection, and we have reports that the disease is continuing to occur.

Mr. GRANGER. The fact that you have had approximately 10,000 cattle slaughtered in the buffer zone would indicate to me that it is trying to break through in every direction. It is up there knocking at your door every day.

Dr. SHAHAN. It would scarcely be foot-and-mouth disease if it did not continue to at least smolder and occasionally break out into flame.

Mr. GRANGER. So to go back into Mexico and try to take up where we left off would be a matter of perhaps slaughtering all the cattle in the infected area?

Dr. SHAHAN. Well, that was one of the main considerations with respect to modification of the program. From all information available, it appeared that there were in the centrally infected area no less than 5,000,000 cattle, and at least about 3,000,000 of the other three susceptible domestic species, so that it would have been a matter of slaughtering at least 14,000,000 animals to eradicate the disease, not considering wild animals and animals which might have been reintroduced into an area supposedly cleaned.

Mr. GRANGER. Of course, I understand your testimony to be that there has not been an outbreak of foot-and-mouth disease north of the quarantine line.

Dr. SHAHAN. No, sir.

Mr. GRANGER. Then perhaps we spent \$40,000,000 wisely.

Mr. WORLEY. Did you say that you had given up hope of eradicating the disease in Mexico?

Dr. SHAHAN. I do not think one should ever give up hope, but I think the hope is very remote.

Mr. WORLEY. You do not think we will ever be successful in eradicating the disease in Mexico?

Dr. SHAHAN. The hope of eradicating the disease, as I see it, depends upon research developments.

Mr. WORLEY. Do you think we will never be able to follow the only tried and true method of eradicating this disease, of killing and burying? You do not think we ever will be able to eradicate it with that process?

Dr. SHAHAN. I do not believe such a program would be tolerated for a day by the Mexican people.

Mr. WORLEY. And what is your recommendation?

Dr. SHAHAN. I think there is only one alternative, to use all the facilities at our command for control, keeping in mind the possible hope of eventual eradication.

Mr. WORLEY. And research to find a cure or preventive?

Dr. SHAHAN. Yes.

Mr. WORLEY. That program should not cost us as much in the future as it has in the past, should it?

Dr. SHAHAN. No. Just how much all of that will cost us depends on how successful we are in our quarantine lines, and how effective the vaccine is, how much cooperation we get from the Mexican people, and things of that order.

Mr. WORLEY. You have not stopped the slaughter program?

Dr. SHAHAN. We are continuing to slaughter with all possible speed the outbreaks in the buffer zone, which is immediately below the northern quarantine line, and southwesterly from the southeastern quarantine line.

Mr. WORLEY. I understood the new plan was to concentrate all of your forces in one given area.

Dr. SHAHAN. Yes.

Mr. WORLEY. An area small enough to get the job done. Then you would clean that out and test and restock it, and then move onto another area. Are you following that program?

Dr. SHAHAN. Yes; I follow you. That has been our major problem from the very beginning, the restocking problem. We were never able to restock as long as we had the possibility, or a calculated possibility, of that disease coming into that area after we had restocked it. We have not reached a point in any area where we figured restocking was safe, except in one area in the buffer zone where the disease occurred some 6 months ago and was eradicated, and has not since recurred.

We believe at the present time that the conditions are such that preliminary or test restocking may be undertaken in that area. Elsewhere we have not even considered the possibility of restocking because of the difficulties of maintaining quarantine lines and preventing the reintroduction of the disease into the new animals.

Mr. WORLEY. By your testimony, I understand, you have not had time to tell whether the new program is working or not?

Dr. SHAHAN. No. I think that will take a period of time for observation and experience to see how successful we are going to be.

Mr. WORLEY. But you have not abandoned the new program, too?

Dr. SHAHAN. Abandoned what?

Mr. WORLEY. You have not abandoned the new program, too; have you?

Dr. SHAHAN. Oh, no.

Mr. WORLEY. You still think the only way you will eradicate it is by finding a cure?

Dr. SHAHAN. Some research development which is not available today. I would not say cure, because actually to attempt to cure the foot-and-mouth disease is not a very satisfactory thing. If we cannot prevent it, then we are in a kind of a bad way.

Mr. WORLEY. I mean a cure and a preventive.

Dr. SHAHAN. At least more information than we have now.

Mr. GILLIE. Doctor, I spoke a few moments ago about the Mexican Army. The Mexican Army is now patrolling that quarantine line. Are they very cooperative? Are they doing a pretty good job?

Dr. SHAHAN. We are going to use more people on that line than we have ever used before. That is strictly American personnel.

Mr. GILLIE. I do not know anything about the treatment of the animals with vaccine. I know a little bit about the killing and destruction of them and burying them since we had an outbreak in Indiana in 1914. How soon does an animal become immune after vaccination? Is there no possible chance if that animal were exposed to foot-and-mouth disease say, tomorrow morning, then was vaccinated, would the animal become immune before it got the disease?

Dr. SHAHAN. According to my understanding—and that would be compatible with immunity in other diseases, if an animal is vaccinated in the incubative stages, or during the time it was subjected to exposure, or after it had been exposed, the possibility of securing immunity is greatly lessened if indeed there is any hope of producing immunity. Generally it is considered that it takes a period of 10 days or 2 weeks to produce full immunity with most any immunizing agent except serum, and that, of course, only gives immunity for a short period.

Mr. GILLIE. Doctor, in view of what you know about the disease in Mexico, and what you know about the situation down in Mexico, and the fact that you know they had to change the program, do you believe the only hope for stopping that thing coming into this country is research?

Dr. SHAHAN. That is not the only hope of stopping it, but it is our only hope of being adequately set up in case it does get into the United States.

As long as the disease exists in Mexico in my opinion we are constantly subjected to a direct threat of its introduction into the United States.

Mr. GILLIE. And the only hope is research?

Dr. SHAHAN. On a long-term basis, yes.

Mr. SIMPSON. Doctor, in case an epidemic should break out in this country, would the Department of Agriculture have any program for eradication? Are you all set up to take care of it if it did break out in this country?

Dr. SHAHAN. I have not been in direct contact with arrangements that may have been made in the Department of Agriculture, but from my period of service in the Department of Agriculture I feel sure that they are set up to immediately attack the disease on an eradication basis.

Mr. GRANGER. Do you have any difficulty in getting personnel for these patrols? We got a report that the Mexicans spend all their money and all their time using the army to stop the local people from interfering with your work. If you get more down there, they will have to have more Army to protect you.

Dr. SHAHAN. The public reaction, of course, is much more favorable to the present modified program than it was to one of outright eradication. The program does not require very many troops in attendance of inspecting veterinarians. Nevertheless, it is necessary on occasion for the army to compel an owner to present his animals for inspection, or to gather them for slaughter, and to see that they are all slaughtered.

The army still has that function, as well as the all-important one of policing the quarantine lines.

Mr. GRANGER. And you do not have any difficulty with them that way now?

Dr. SHAHAN. The public reaction is generally favorable.

Mr. GRANGER. I never could see how you could have a program of restocking down there, because it would mean that you would need a half dozen lines. If you cleaned out a territory and then restocked it, you would have to have another quarantine around that, would you not?

Dr. SHAHAN. Yes; that was our conclusion after working there for a period of months.

Mr. GRANGER. The first program was predicated on the theory that we would have a progressive slaughter program continually moving ahead.

Dr. SHAHAN. Yes; progressive slaughter and restocking. We have not reached the point where we have acquiesced in substantial restocking of any given area.

Mr. GRANGER. What do you do in this buffer zone where you kill a Mexican's ox? Do you give the man another ox?

Dr. SHAHAN. It would be inadvisable to give him another susceptible animal until we are sure that that area is safe for restocking. Actually, that is just another form of restocking. We have agreed to participate in replacing those oxen with nonsusceptible mules. In consideration of the change of the program and the probability that there will be a great many less oxen slaughtered, it has been contemplated that the oxen replacement program would taper off materially.

Mr. GRANGER. Do you do that in the buffer zone now?

Dr. SHAHAN. We have not yet undertaken it in the buffer zone.

Mr. GRANGER. It seems to me that would create quite a problem, having a man whose oxen had been killed and his support taken away from him, without giving him something in its place.

Dr. SHAHAN. Of course, in much of this buffer zone we are away from the area in which the ox is the main bovine animal. We are getting up into the border of the range country, and it is a matter of meat production or dairy production rather than of draft power.

Mr. GILLIE. Doctor, we thank you very much for coming before this committee. When we think of all the troubles and worries and long hours and the patience you have had down there, we think you have done a pretty good piece of work. We compliment you and the Bureau of Animal Industry for the work that you are doing down there.

Thank you very much.

Dr. SHAHAN. Thank you, sir.

Mr. GILLIE. The next witness will be Mr. Mollin.

STATEMENT OF F. E. MOLLIN, EXECUTIVE SECRETARY, NATIONAL LIVESTOCK ASSOCIATION

Mr. GILLIE. Mr. Mollin, will you state your name and position to the reporter?

Mr. MOLLIN. F. E. Mollin, executive secretary of the American National Livestock Association, Denver, Colo.

I might say that our association has kept in pretty close touch with foot-and-mouth disease matters for a good many years. In fact, par-

ticularly since the Argentine convention was negotiated in May 1935. We have been very much disturbed, as have all other representatives of the livestock producers of this country, at the developments in Mexico. I think there is a unanimity of opinion among the livestock producers because of the developments in Mexico of the need for research. That is quite common throughout the country.

The Livestock Advisory Committee appointed by Secretary Anderson has stressed the need for setting up research facilities practically from the first meeting it held last summer.

I might say that personally I have been a little bit skeptical about the possible developments from a research program, and I do not mean to indicate by that that I am against research, but the question that I suggested to Dr. Shope this morning indicates what I have in mind, that the major objective, as I see it, is that you might increase or double the life of the immunity that you can get from a vaccine. While that would certainly be a worth-while accomplishment, and while they undoubtedly might secure much other valuable knowledge relative to handling the disease, I question whether that is sufficient to justify taking any severe risks in the process of getting that information and perfecting the vaccine.

I want to make just a brief reference to what has already been done in Mexico. While I realize the cost seems heavy, I certainly do feel that it has been justified. I mean that the result has justified that expense of \$40,000,000, because it has at least given us a chance to get organized in this country. I believe every State sanitary official is organized so that every State is on the alert. It is still 250 miles below our border, and I feel confident that if every effort had not been made the foot-and-mouth disease would be at least up to our border today, and undoubtedly we would have had breaks in this country.

I do not subscribe to the belief that even if worst comes to worst we are going to surrender to foot-and-mouth disease and allow it to become saddled on this country like it is on many European countries and on the South American countries. I think we will continue to fight it with the slaughter method of eradication, and that it is quite likely that if we get to that stage it will be found that a vaccine, if it can be used as it is even at the present stage of development, or if it can be perfected beyond its present stage, will be useful in preventing the spread.

I still cling to the position that we are not going to live with foot-and-mouth disease in this country.

In connection with the question that this bill presents, one thing that I feel very strongly about is that there is no great need for haste. The livestock industry of this country and the Congress of this country have been sold the idea that it was not safe to bring this virus into the country even for experimental purposes under the most close control. This is a pretty sudden change in attitude. For instance, we just had our annual convention at Boise, Idaho, 2 weeks ago. We had no knowledge at the time of our meeting there with one of the biggest crowds that we ever had that there was any such proposition coming up. I feel that before Congress would approve any such step as is here proposed that there ought to be adequate time for the livestock industry of this country to understand more fully than they certainly do today just what is being proposed. I certainly do not

feel like taking it on myself, with very little opportunity to contact the cattlemen in the numerous States who are members of our association, to say that we would approve such a proposal overnight that is such a radical departure from our previous position. We certainly cannot take that responsibility. I think a matter of a few weeks is not too important here.

I think Dr. Simms testified yesterday that it might be a year and a half before they could complete the buildings that were contemplated. Numerous witnesses have talked about 10 years or 20 years. If this is such a long-time program that we are getting into, then it seems to me that we can well take a few weeks here at the beginning in order to carefully consider just what is the best thing for this country.

Mr. GILLIE. Will the gentleman yield there?

Mr. MOLLIN. Yes.

Mr. GILLIE. That is what we are having this hearing for. We want to get the views of people on all sides of this problem. We are anxious to hear all of the livestock men and those who are interested in livestock work, sanitarians, specialists, scientists, and get their views on what they think we should do. We want to hear everybody on this important program.

Mr. MOLLIN. That is why I suggested you cannot get that done so quickly, in a matter of a couple of weeks. There are some 80,000,000 cattle in this country and millions of hogs and sheep, and I venture to say that the great majority of the producers of that livestock have no knowledge of what is going on in Washington today. I had no knowledge of it until I reached Washington last week.

It seems to me that it is just something that it would be well to make haste a little bit slowly in at the start. We have a long time to finish it. Once you start on a program of this kind, you have a long time to wonder whether you did it right in the beginning.

I want to say also that I certainly do not think you should commit the United States to a program that takes a tremendous appropriation that might endanger the willingness of the Appropriations Committee to carry on the program in Mexico. To me, the first consideration today is to keep up the work that Dr. Shahan just told you about. I think he is entirely right, that they live down there in utter danger of having the disease break over that line and having to slaughter cattle to hold that line. I am sure he is right in expressing the thought that we cannot forever hold that quarantine line if we do not do anything to push the disease back.

I will never forget a statement that Dr. Simms made in the beginning of this program, that in fighting hoof-and-mouth disease you either win or you lose. There are no draws. Sitting on a quarantine line is trying to call it a draw.

While I do not mean to suggest that you should lose any unnecessary time, I think it is important that you should take enough time that the country is fully apprised of what the situation is.

To my own way of thinking, in the limited time that I have had to think about it, it seems to me that a desirable island such as Congressman Bramblett has mentioned two or three times would be preferable to Mexico. I am not sure but what I agree with the thought that has been expressed by some of the scientists here that there would be serious obstacles in Mexico. I am not ready to say today, for our

association or for myself, that we can approve the idea of an establishment in this country.

While I have studied and read a good deal about foot-and-mouth disease, I think the main source of infection, from all I have read and gathered, is by pretty direct contact. At the same time, you cannot eliminate the possibility that there are occasional breaks from other sources.

Possibly you know Dr. Gibson over here in Virginia. I had occasion to see him in Richmond a year or two ago, and discussed with him the 1914 outbreak. He has a very positive feeling that the crows carried the 1914 outbreak across the Ohio River. I think that is quite possible, although I believe from all I have read about foot-and-mouth disease that it is a very rare occasion that any infection can be traced to birds. I think it is generally by direct contact of diseased animals with a susceptible animal, or by a person or vehicle coming directly from infected premises onto clean premises. I think that is the way disease is most ordinarily spread.

We have stamped out every outbreak in this country. I believe there have been nine. They have stamped those outbreaks out by removing the main sources of infection. They have never paid any attention to birds in any of these efforts they have made to eradicate the disease in this country. We have also accomplished the purpose even in California, in 1924 and 1929. They were successful with no reference to the thousands of gulls and other birds that circle around over that country. That does not say that they could not do it, but the fact remains that we have stamped out the various outbreaks in this country by eliminating the principal contacts through which the disease is spread.

I do not think we want to magnify the dangers, yet we cannot eliminate the possibility that the disease could get away in one of these ways that is hard to stop through these ordinary processes. I think we ought to set up research some place, and I think, eventually, of course, Congress has to decide where it will be.

I am not optimistic about a cure being found. I do not know that they will ever find a cure for a virus disease. I am hopeful that they will extend the life of the immunity gained by the use of vaccine. Perhaps they can find cheaper ways to make it. At the same time, I want to call attention to the fact that no disease is ever eradicated with a vaccine. All you do when you perfect a vaccine is to perfect the means of control. When you accept vaccine as your principal agent you accept the disease if you allow it to become established in a country. We certainly have not reached that point, and I hope we never reach the point that we accept the disease and accept even an improved vaccine as a means of control. We have enough diseases that we combat with vaccines today, and I know the livestock industry does not wish to have another disease saddled on it. In this case it would require not merely one vaccination as for blackleg, but at least one vaccination a year, or perhaps twice a year, if you really had this country saturated with foot-and-mouth disease.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Mollin, how successful have Denmark and Switzerland been in their vaccinations?

Mr. MOLLIN. Switzerland, I understand, does make an effort to stamp out foot-and-mouth disease. They employ vaccine, if I am

correctly informed, around the boundaries of the countries that join them. I believe they touch Spain, France, and Germany, all three. They vaccinate on the borders toward those countries as a precaution against the spread of the disease. But the disease does jump over, and they do have outbreaks, and they have to kill them.

Up in the Scandinavian countries, so far as I know in recent years, they have not made any effort at eradication by the slaughter method. I think they have in times past, but not to my knowledge recently.

Mr. SIMPSON. We have heard constantly about vaccination in Denmark. Do you have any information to give the committee as to that?

Mr. MOLLIN. No; I have no specific information on Denmark, but I want to reiterate the point I made just a moment ago—that that is merely a control agent. We do not want to get to the point in this country where we rely upon vaccine as a control agent.

I think we must plan to stick to the eradication program, even though we might, if Mexico gets infected clear up to our border, be up against the gun a good deal as England is today. England has these repeated outbreaks of foot-and-mouth disease.

Dr. Galloway stated yesterday that they had only had them infrequently recently, but I have seen the records a few years back when over a full year's time there was not a single month when England did not have an outbreak of foot-and-mouth disease. They stamp it out by the slaughter method. We might come to that point—where we could expect to have an outbreak some place every month and have to slaughter and bury the cattle.

As I see it, under the program that I envisage for the future of the United States, even with foot-and-mouth disease against us on the southern border, vaccine would come in as a means of preventing the spread and not to be accepted beyond that point as the means of control.

Mr. SIMPSON. How do you feel about the establishment of a research laboratory in this country?

Mr. MOLLIN. Well, I said that I am not in a position to approve it. Our people do not know enough about it. We have been educated to believe that it was dangerous to experiment with foot-and-mouth disease in this country. I have talked to Dr. Mohler about it numerous times when he was Chief of the Bureau. This is a radical change of policy.

I have talked to our new president, Mr. Smith, of Sterling, Colo., who will be in Washington tomorrow, and we feel that we cannot reverse this policy without greater opportunity to consult with the leading members of our State associations scattered throughout the West and South.

Reference was made this morning, I think, to the expedition that was sent down to Patagonia. I think it was a one-man expedition. The purpose of that trip was to find out if foot-and-mouth disease existed in the Province of Tierra del Fuego. You will recall that a remarkable decision had been made that Tierra del Fuego was not a part of Argentina because the Straits of Magellan are between the mainland of Argentina and their island. So the Attorney General, or someone in the Department of Agriculture, had ruled that it was not a part of Argentina and that therefore they brought in imports

of lamb, which is the principal product of that island, without reference to the embargo provision of our tariff act.

While it has been stated this morning that that report has never been made public, the fact remains that the subject was dropped when the man got back and no further effort was made to bring in that product, which rather speaks for itself as to what happened.

There is one other point that I would like to make about research. For many years we have been subjected to a determined attack from South America, and it has been promoted by individuals in this country. I have often suspected that some of them have been subsidized by the Argentine meat producers. The program is to try to break down the sanitary embargo of our tariff act, section 306 (a), which prohibits the entry of live animals, or dressed meats, or the cloven-hoofed meats from any country where the foot-and-mouth disease exists. In fighting that campaign we have had to rely almost entirely upon the research of foreign countries.

Dr. Galloway's statement here yesterday was that if we had had that during the height of that Argentine effort to get into this country it would have been invaluable to us. He told us just what we have always contended, but did not have any definite proof of our own, that it was dangerous to import meat into this country. I think from that standpoint it would be extremely valuable to have our research and our facts emanating from this country, about how long the germ of the foot-and-mouth disease lives in the carcass of an animal under these conditions, whether it is chilled or frozen, and so on.

Mr. SIMPSON. You say you think that is valuable and yet you say you do not believe anything should be done on this legislation until all the cattle growers that you represent have been consulted.

Mr. MOLLIN. I did not not say all of them. I said I do not see any great need for haste; that is, a matter of a few weeks. This thing is important. Every livestock producer in this country recognizes its importance. I think if I were in the position that you gentlemen are in on the committee I certainly would not want to take the responsibility of recommending legislation of this kind until the people of the country had had a fair opportunity to study it and make protests.

There are two or three of us here today representing the livestock producers on very short notice. We are not prepared to say that we can accept this proposal, this right-about-face in direction. I do not think the results that are held out in the way of research on foot-and-mouth disease, which has been going on in foreign countries for at least a quarter of a century, are such as to indicate any tremendous need to get started on this in 2 or 3 weeks from now. I think we can take a little time here and study this situation and that we will all be better satisfied if we do that.

Mr. GRANGER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIMPSON. Yes.

Mr. GRANGER. I understood the chairman to say that we were going to give ample time for witnesses to be heard. Surely this committee does not believe in rushing you people too much.

Mr. MOLLIN. I do not mean to say that you are, but the fact remains that the country has had very little knowledge of this proceeding. It came up very suddenly. If you gentlemen are ready to take the responsibility, I am not going to tell you when to vote on it.

Mr. GRANGER. How long will it take to get the agreement of your people?

Mr. MOLLIN. I think if the information was sent out to the country in a matter of 3 or 4 weeks we probably could get quite a little reaction as to how they felt about it. We have not had any opportunity, as far as our association is concerned, to even contact our important people.

Mr. GRANGER. I agree with what you say. I think we should not make too much haste, that we should give an opportunity for the industry to be heard.

Mr. MOLLIN. I do not know that this proceeding here is directly concerned with the matter of building a fence on the border, but I do think that that ties right in with this threat that Dr. Shahan pointed out.

I hope we can get some action on the border fence and we certainly want to make it known that we are not going to yield to the embargo, maintaining the embargo against Mexican cattle.

When you had the hearing here last month you will remember the gentleman from Arizona who was urging that these cattle from northern Mexico should be brought into this country. That would not merely involve Mexico, that involves every other country in the world to which section 306 (a) of the tariff act applies.

Mr. WORLEY. If we bring that virus into this country and it gets loose, there would be little use in having a fence down there, would there?

Mr. MOLLIN. That is right. As far as I know, there is no prohibition now to keep them from bringing the virus in.

Mr. WORLEY. I understand there is no prohibition at all. The Secretary can by regulation permit entry or conduct research on either rinderpest or foot-and-mouth disease, and I suppose any other disease. But I also understand the Department, in view of the opposition to such a program, has decided that it would be better to have Congress say one way or the other. There has been no disposition, as far as I know, to speed up hearings on this proposal. I am sure the chairman is as fair as any man in the House and he will give you and all others ample time to be heard.

Mr. MOLLIN. I did not say that critically.

Mr. WORLEY. I felt sure that you didn't, but I just wanted to correct that impression in case others felt that way.

Now, on the question of research, there is no one on this committee, so far as I know, who is opposed to the right kind of research on foot-and-mouth disease. The only question that occurs is where is the most desirable place to conduct such research. Do you not think it would be desirable and just as economical and just as productive for this country to cooperate with other countries which have spent years in research? Do you not think it would be more desirable to do that rather than take the risk of importing virus into this country? Have you given that any thought?

Mr. MOLLIN. Well, my own thought is that the best thing to do would be to establish our own laboratory on an island such as was mentioned by Mr. Bramblett or any other island. I do not care where the island is. I would prefer to have that kind of an arrangement.

I recall that during the war Dr. Mohler would not even allow meat from South America to be transferred from one boat to another in an

American harbor. That shows how careful he was about bringing in the disease or any possibility of it.

In the early days of the war I attended a meeting in one of the numerous set-ups with initials where Dr. Mohler told us they were bringing meat up here from South America and going to reship it. They were going to reload it here in the boats to go to Europe and he would not allow them to make that transfer in an American harbor. It was arranged, I think, on some British island or some place where they transferred this meat.

Mr. WORLEY. On that point, do you know of any country that has ever allowed the virus to come into its borders for any purpose until the disease was already there?

Mr. MOLLIN. No; I do not, but I would say, of course, that in England they keep up constant research and at times they are free of the disease. They take the risk of continuing the research, even though for a period of weeks at a time they might not have disease on the island.

Mr. WORLEY. Do you think we would be justified in taking such a chance?

Mr. MOLLIN. In doing that here?

Mr. WORLEY. Yes.

Mr. MOLLIN. No; I do not feel like we should today. If we can make some other arrangements, it would be better.

I think we should conduct research, and I think that the authorities of the Congress will have to decide where it can best be done and where it is the safest to do it.

Mr. WORLEY. That is what we are trying to decide now. That is why I asked you if you have any better solution.

Mr. MOLLIN. I have already made my suggestion, that I would prefer an island.

Mr. WORLEY. Why an island, because it is isolated and less dangerous?

Mr. MOLLIN. Yes; I do not worry much about the airborne feature or the birds; as a matter of fact I understand that what they contemplate under this plan is to have the buildings entirely covered, which would eliminate the bird question, I should think, and to a large extent eliminate the possibility of air-borne dust.

Mr. WORLEY. Do you think it is just as safe to build this laboratory on the eastern coast of the United States as it would be on an island?

Mr. MOLLIN. No; I do not think so.

Mr. WORLEY. That is all, thank you.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Mollin, do you understand that the Secretary of Agriculture has authority at the present time to conduct these experiments as he sees fit?

Mr. MOLLIN. So far as I know, he has, but I have not made any extensive study of the subject.

Mr. SIMPSON. You say you think he has?

Mr. MOLLIN. I should think so.

Mr. SIMPSON. If he has, I would not see any reason for this legislation.

Mr. MOLLIN. Well, they want the money.

Mr. SIMPSON. That calls for an appropriation, not an authorization.

Mr. MOLLIN. I think it is the right approach for them to seek the authorization. Whether they might have the power or not, it is still a good thing. Of course, there may be regulations that the Secretary has issued which bar such importations, but I am quite sure it is not covered in the embargo proceedings of the tariff act which authorizes the Secretary of Agriculture to notify the Secretary of the Treasury whenever foot-and-mouth disease breaks out in any foreign country. Until he again notifies the Secretary of the Treasury that the disease no longer exists, the Secretary of the Treasury cannot accept imports through customs of the animals or the dressed products from those animals. I do not think there is any reference in that provision that would apply to the virus.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Chairman, if there is anyone in this room from the Department of Agriculture that can tell this committee whether or not the Secretary of Agriculture has such authority, I would like to know it. I am sure the other members would also, like the information.

Mr. MOLLIN. I think they asked Dr. Schoening this morning to supply that information. Perhaps you were out.

Mr. GILLIE. Yes; we did.

Any other questions?

Mr. WORLEY. I understand that the Department does have such authority and that it has had it for years.

Mr. GILLIE. Mr. Mollin, we thank you very much for appearing before this committee.

Now, we will hear from Mr. Sanders, who has to leave here soon.

Will you state your name to the reporter, and the group you represent?

STATEMENT OF J. T. SANDERS, LEGISLATIVE COUNSEL, NATIONAL GRANGE

Mr. SANDERS. My name is J. T. Sanders. I represent the Grange as its legislative counsel.

Mr. GILLIE. You may proceed.

Mr. SANDERS. I presume that in this matter the committee would like to know what the views of the Grange are on whether or not research should be authorized, and I think I can briefly state that we have practically at all times supported research in agriculture. We feel that any expenditures for research are practically never wasted, that they are just as important to nonagricultural people as to agricultural people and therefore in line with that general policy I believe the Grange would heartily support any move to conduct a proper research on the foot-and-mouth disease.

I have listened to the testimony here of the scientists and the veterinarians and I have been convinced that we know very little about the nature of the disease, how it is transmitted, and certainly do not know as yet how it can be combated to the best advantage except through the one tried method of slaughter. It seems very strange that such a devastating disease should not be under control and under careful study, by the best scientists that we have.

Of course, I can understand why we have not seen fit to institute intense research, so long as we had a very careful and adequate pro-

tection against the disease being brought in. We certainly are in no situation to postpone research now. I do not know whether that should be in this country or abroad.

As to whether the Secretary has the permission or not, or the authority or not, I do not know. I think that if he does not have it we should clearly give him the authority and the necessary funds for conducting the research.

I am sure the Grange cannot contribute any information or worthwhile opinions on whether it is best to conduct this research in the United States or abroad. We would necessarily expect a decision on that point to be made on the basis of the scientists who have to do the work and the judgment of the committee. I do not feel at all competent to contribute to the solution of that question, which I understand you are trying to answer at the present time.

However, it does seem to me that in view of the fact that the Mexican Government seems to be perfectly willing to try out the efficacy of vaccines that we should waste no time in testing every known vaccine in the present situation in Mexico. That might be considered the emergency phase of your research. It seems to me that it is a golden opportunity to do extensive research immediately and whether the various vaccines that are now developed by the different countries that have done extensive work along this line are sufficient for eradication or combating of this disease.

Further than that I have no opinions and I am sure that if we form an opinion in the future it will be by consultation of livestock men and scientific men who know something about the disease.

I believe, Mr. Chairman, that is about all that I care to say.

Mr. GILLIE. Were you here yesterday?

Mr. SANDERS. Yes.

Mr. GILLIE. It was brought out yesterday that the Mexican people are setting up a research laboratory, that they want to control that themselves. For us to go down there and go in partnership with them would be out, as far as our own research work is concerned.

Mr. SANDERS. I was here yesterday, but not during the entire session and that testimony was evidently not given when I was here. If that is the case, of course you certainly could not do research there.

Mr. GILLIE. What would be your opinion of the best place to have such a research laboratory, if one was established?

Mr. SANDERS. In my opinion where would be the best place?

Mr. GILLIE. Yes.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Chairman, I feel that I know so little about the technical aspects of this problem that I would be utterly unable to express an opinion that would be worth much to the committee on that. I am sure I speak for Mr. Goss and other members of the Grange when I say we prefer that that be decided by the technicians and this committee on the basis of what the technicians say about the matter.

Mr. GILLIE. You are speaking for the Grange?

Mr. SANDERS. Yes, sir.

Mr. GILLIE. They are certainly in favor of research.

Mr. SANDERS. Without a question. I am pretty sure I am absolutely safe on that. Mr. Goss and I have not talked this over. He is out

of town. I am quite sure that that would be the opinion of the Grange.

Mr. GILLIE. Any questions?

Mr. WORLEY. You are principally interested in research, not only in the foot-and-mouth disease but all measures of research that can be accomplished for the good of the American agriculturist; are you not?

Mr. SANDERS. You mean my previous experience and training?

Mr. WORLEY. No; I do not mean your personal interests and business, I mean your interest today is in a program of research.

Mr. SANDERS. I understood that was mainly the problem that was before the committee at this time, whether or not you would establish adequate research facilities.

Mr. WORLEY. But the question of where seems to be the dividing line. You have no recommendations to make on that?

Mr. SANDERS. No; I believe, Mr. Worley, that that question can be decided far better by the scientists and the committee on the basis of the testimony that the scientists give. I do not believe that the Grange would be willing, and certainly I would not be willing, to make a recommendation as to whether it should be in this country or on an island or whether it should be done by cooperating with other countries that have done extensive work.

It seems to me that we should certainly not leave unexplored the possibility of cooperating with other countries in this work.

Mr. WORLEY. We are way behind, I think. This country is way behind in a research program on that disease as well as on many others.

Mr. SANDERS. I presume we are, because as I understand it we have never done any intensive organized research on the foot-and-mouth disease—that is, in the form of a well-organized laboratory and with an adequate staff financed properly.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Sanders, you stated that you believed the Grange was highly in favor of this program.

Mr. SANDERS. I think I should qualify that and say that I am sure the Grange is in favor of a research program.

Mr. SIMPSON. Do you believe they are in favor of a research program so far as to bring the virus into this country?

Mr. SANDERS. I do not get the question.

Mr. SIMPSON. Do you think the Grange is in favor of research to the point of bringing the virus into this country?

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Simpson, I intended to answer that in the statement I made just previously, that I do not care to express an opinion as to whether the Grange would be favorable to bringing the virus in and doing the research here or arranging for research outside the borders.

Mr. SIMPSON. Do you feel that the Grange should have additional opportunity to be heard on that when you have obtained that information?

Mr. SANDERS. I will be glad to submit a statement on that point if the committee requests me to do so when I have had time to consult the proper authorities in the Grange on that point.

Mr. SIMPSON. I believe that there is not a member of the Agriculture Committee but what believes in research. We all believe in that. The question is whether we should bring the virus into this country. That seems to be the bone of contention, as well as the location of the research plant.

Mr. SANDERS. Yes; I understand from listening to the testimony that that is the significant question you are trying to answer at the present time.

Mr. SIMPSON. You are not prepared to state whether or not the Grange or the cattle feeders who belong to the Grange would sanction bringing the virus into this country for experimental purposes?

Mr. SANDERS. No; I am not. My best judgment now would be that they would be pretty careful on saying that they favored that. I mean, they would hesitate to say that. I am not sure that my judgment is right in that respect. I would have to check with the executive board and with Mr. Goss.

Mr. SIMPSON. And you feel that your organization should have further opportunity to be heard?

Mr. SANDERS. Well, if the committee would like us to make a statement on that. If you would like us to make such a statement or express our opinion on that point, I will be glad to submit a statement to you in writing or appear before the committee at any time that it is possible.

Mr. SIMPSON. As one member of the committee, I would like to have it, but I repeat while we all believe in research it is the question of the approach to the research and again it goes right back to whether or not your members and your organization want it.

I want to contact the Farm Bureau in Illinois to see whether or not they approve of bringing the virus into this country.

Mr. SANDERS. Well, if that is the only question before the committee, I am afraid I have not done very much good, but I thought that you really had in mind whether or not you would authorize an extensive and adequate research program and then, secondly, where that research should be conducted.

Now, the second question I am not able to answer, but as to the first I am absolutely sure in my own mind that the Grange is highly favorable to authorize an extensive research program.

Mr. SIMPSON. Do you realize that the Appropriations Committee has appropriated 35 to 40 million dollars already for the Mexican program and there will probably be another request for the next program? The only estimate that we have had so far is 15 to 25 million for the research program. If we report this favorably, we will have authorized them to spend \$25,000,000.

Mr. SANDERS. Yes; I realize that we have spent approximately the sum that you have mentioned, and that from all the information which we get the outbreak is about as extensive or more extensive than it was at the time we began. The question is not whether we should fight the disease further, but one of establishing adequate facilities.

Mr. WORLEY. Do you think that money has been wasted?

Mr. SANDERS. I doubt it very much. I imagine you would have had some disease in Texas by this time if you had not spent that 35 or 40 million, Mr. Worley.

Mr. WORLEY. There is no question about that.

Mr. SANDERS. I do not think there is any question but what it has not been wasted. Probably it did not give us the results that we thought it would give at the time it was appropriated.

Mr. WORLEY. That we hoped it would give?

Mr. SANDERS. That we thought and hoped. At least the Grange thought that possibly it would give far greater results than it has.

Mr. SIMPSON. I think the committee thought so.

Mr. SANDERS. Well, I am sure they did.

Mr. GRANGER. Mr. Sanders, the Grange, of course, is interested in livestock the same as it is in other farming activities, is it not?

Mr. SANDERS. Yes, indeed. I imagine that the Grange has as large a membership in the dairy industry as any other organization in the country.

Mr. GRANGER. And in speaking of research, of course, your organization would make no distinction as between research for hoof-and-mouth disease and research for any other agricultural activity.

Mr. SANDERS. No; but my statement here was primarily pointed toward research for the foot-and-mouth disease.

Mr. GRANGER. I think your statement has been very helpful to the committee. That is the problem before the committee, whether or not we are going to engage in further research on hoof-and-mouth disease. The matter of location is one that will have to come up later. There is no question about that.

Mr. GILLIE. Mr. Sanders; we thank you very much for coming before this committee to give us your views.

Mr. SANDERS. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. GILLIE. Now, I have a telegram here from the president of the Texas and Southwestern Cattle Raisers' Association authorizing Joe Montague to appear. We would like to hear from Mr. Montague at this time.

**STATEMENT OF JUDGE JOE G. MONTAGUE, GENERAL ATTORNEY,
TEXAS AND SOUTHWESTERN CATTLE RAISERS ASSOCIATION,
AND REPRESENTING JOINT LIVESTOCK COMMITTEE**

Mr. GILLIE. Mr. Montague, you may give the reporter your name and the official title of your office.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Well, I am Joe G. Montague, general counsel for the Texas and Southwestern Cattle Raisers Association, and represent them in this appearance. I also appear for the Joint Livestock Committee, which is a composite organization of many different livestock organizations from all over the United States.

Mr. GILLIE. Does that mean several livestock associations in the United States besides the Texas organization?

Mr. MONTAGUE. Yes, sir; there were 134 of those organizations originally in the joint livestock organization.

Mr. GRANGER. Do they belong to the National Livestock Association?

Mr. MONTAGUE. Some of them may, but in this work they were independent of any other organization. There were 134 of them from every State in the Union.

Mr. GILLIE. What group do they belong to?

Mr. MONTAGUE. The Joint Livestock Committee. I speak for them as well as the Texas organization here at this time.

At the outset, I want to assure you that the people I represent are enthusiastically in favor of a research program to solve the foot-and-mouth problem. However, we are not in favor of it to the extent of wanting to bring the virus into the United States. Rather than have research—and there will be no equivocation about my statement

there—if it depended on bringing the virus into this country, we would forego the research. We are emphatically against bringing the virus into this country for research or any other purpose.

It is a little embarrassing to us to make that statement in view of the fact that the Bureau of Animal Industry is requesting the authority to bring the virus in for research purposes and for generations the Bureau of Animal Industry of our Department of Agriculture has been our fairy godfather. We have always supported that Bureau, and we deeply appreciate its years and years of good and generous service to the industry, but in this instance we feel that they are asking the industry to take a risk that is not warranted. We feel that the same results can be obtained, possibly at a little more cost or with a little more difficult situation, but certainly the same results could be obtained without taking the risk of bringing the virus into this country.

I want to make a statement also at this point with reference to something that Dr. Schoening stated in answer to a question, I believe, by Mr. Simpson. He was asked whether or not the Secretary of Agriculture now had the authority to bring the virus into this country for research purposes. I believe Dr. Schoening stated that in his judgment the Secretary did have that authority and some of the others have indicated they thought the same way about it.

I do not think that is right. I think we have a statutory prohibition against the bringing of the virus in for any purpose, research or otherwise. My reason is this: Section 306 (a) of the Tariff Act is a statutory prohibition against bringing in either an animal or meat from any country where foot-and-mouth disease is prevalent. The virus is just as much a part of the animal as the blood or the bones or the flesh and there is a legal maxim that the whole will include any part thereof, and the prohibition against bringing in the animal itself would be a statutory prohibition against bringing in any part of the animal.

Therefore, I think there is a statutory prohibition against bringing in the virus for any purpose in this country.

I would like to have the opinion of the Solicitor General's office in the Department of Agriculture to see whether or not their opinion would be agreeable with that, but I think it would be a little hard to answer.

Mr. WORLEY. We have asked for their opinion.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I think it is so axiomatic that to me it is very clear.

Mr. WORLEY. I hope your construction is right, but I think you can ship it in without that violation, because that section treats purely of the importation of animals.

Mr. MONTAGUE. And meat.

Mr. WORLEY. Animals and meat from the country in which the foot-and-mouth disease exists.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Well, I take the position the virus is as much a part of the animal as the bone or the blood.

Mr. WORLEY. It seems to me the virus itself is not a natural part of the animal like the bone or blood, but we will not argue about that—but I hope your construction is correct.

Mr. MONTAGUE. All right. If I am wrong in that construction of that article of the statutes, then we ought to have such a statute, and

I hope some member of the committee will not let the ink dry on the report that this committee makes before the bill is introduced to enforce a statutory prohibition against bringing in of the virus.

When this bill was first introduced—it was just last week we heard about it—we made a poll of the directorate by telephone of our organization, and as a result of that I flew up here Sunday night because the directorate unanimously voted to interpose our opposition to the bill. In expressing the views that I do here, I am not just expressing my own but I am expressing the views of a great many cattle producers, and I mean actual ranchmen who work and produce cattle.

Mr. GRANGER. Have you got the names of the directors to put in the record?

Mr. MONTAGUE. I can do that; yes, sir.

Mr. GRANGER. I think it would be worth having.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I will do that.

Mr. GRANGER. I do not want the directors, I want the ones who told you to appear here in opposition to this legislation. I want their names.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Well, it is those 63 directors. They were polled by telephone and unanimously voted for me to appear in opposition to the bill.

Mr. GRANGER. Then there will be no need to put them in the record.

Mr. MONTAGUE. All right. It is those 63 directors of the association.

Mr. WORLEY. I might add further for the record that the president of the Texas and Southwestern Cattle Raisers Association assured me also by telephone that they were unanimously opposed to allowing this virus into the country.

Mr. GRANGER. Would you make that statement and stand on that without further consultation with your directors as a result of these hearings?

Mr. MONTAGUE. Yes, sir. I can make that statement definitely at this time.

Mr. GRANGER. If it were shown that we were going to establish it offshore somewhere or on a peninsula of this country?

Mr. MONTAGUE. The idea of the peninsula, of course, was not advanced, but my instructions were to oppose the establishment of a research laboratory and bringing the virus anywhere into the continental United States, which would include, of course, any peninsula.

Mr. GILLIE. Would that include an island?

Mr. MONTAGUE. No, sir; we favor an island.

Mr. WORLEY. Why do you favor an island?

Mr. MONTAGUE. Well, the Bureau of Animal Industry, which I say has always been our fairy godfather in reference to animal diseases, has impressed us very forcibly for many, many years with the idea and the lesson that bringing in of the virus for research purposes was too dangerous and therefore it should never be done. I say they impressed us with that, and we learned to believe it, and we still believe it.

Mr. WORLEY. I think last February they impressed this subcommittee with the danger of bringing in virus and I am still impressed.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I have discussed that with the Chief of the Bureau and his predecessors for many years. I have talked it over with Dr. Mohler and on down the line. They have always told me that same

thing, that they would never allow the virus to come into this country, would never bring it in because it was too dangerous.

Now, let's analyze the reasons why they say it is all right to do it now. These gentlemen have stated that the fact that the foot-and-mouth disease has broken out in Mexico and has become established down there apparently leaves no hope of eradication. I believe the exact words Dr. Shahan used were that there was only a very remote hope of eradication in Mexico. I do not see that that fact has made the disease any less fearful than it was before, nor do I think that it has made the danger of bringing the virus into this country less than it was before the disease existed in Mexico. In fact, I think that that might be very good reason for interposing even greater safeguards than we have had heretofore. We must take no chances. They all admit that there is an element of danger in doing it.

Dr. Schope testified, and to use his exact language he said it would be "pretty safe." By golly, the cattle people are not going to rest on something that is "pretty safe." We want it to be a lot safer than that. I think those were his exact words.

The other gentlemen have all stated in answer to questions that there was danger of bringing the virus in for research purposes, that there was some danger. Why take the chance? Their answers to that are these: The personnel problem was one. The reference to the plan in Mexico, the bringing in of susceptible animals across an infected zone so that they would not be in contact with the virus in any way interposed an objection there. The jurisdiction or control over the facilities would not be as complete in a foreign country as they would in the United States.

With reference to that last objection, of course that objection would pass out if the establishment were placed on an island that was within the jurisdiction of the United States.

The second objection would also pass out for the same reason, that the animals could be brought in without being placed in contact with the virus. That is, susceptible animals, clean, normal animals, to use their expression, could be brought in without being endangered by contact.

That leaves the one objection, then, that needs answering, which is the one of acquiring personnel.

Of course, I never hired a scientist in my life, and I do not know anything about their psychological reactions. I guess they are normal, human beings. I think this situation poses a very definite challenge to the scientific mind and the scientific body of the world today. I think that the scientists should respond, and I think they will respond to a challenge of that kind. Are there no more Pasteurs or Curies in the world to enter into a program of this kind?

I cannot conceive of scientists allowing this challenge to go unanswered just because of the personal temporary difficulties that might be involved. I think that science will produce the personnel. I think they could be made available. I do not think any of the objections that these gentlemen have offered to placing the facilities on some island within the jurisdiction of the United States are unanswered. I do not think they are sound objections, and I think the reasons that they have given us why it should not be brought into the United States are unanswered and never will be answered.

I think that is all I care to say.

Mr. GILLIE. Mr. Montague, assuming now that the vaccine was our only hope and that a laboratory was our only hope and that foot-and-mouth disease broke over that quarantine line and came up toward our line 5 miles one day and 15 miles or so another, what would you suggest as the best means of trying to stop the disease before it got to this line. Are you still of the opinion that we should not have a research laboratory in this country?

Mr. MONTAGUE. Well, I would say until the disease got in here and was established in here we should never have a research laboratory in this country that involved bringing the virus in.

Mr. GILLIE. Would not the people criticize this group very severely if we did not do something?

Mr. MONTAGUE. Do something. Establish one on an island out here.

Mr. GILLIE. You still think your group would allow this research laboratory to be built on an island?

Mr. MONTAGUE. Yes, sir; I am sure that is right. The expressions I have had have been very, very emphatic on the proposition. You asked in case the disease broke out above the quarantine line in Mexico what I would recommend.

Now, what I am going to say is my own idea and not the idea of anyone I represent. I want to differentiate from that. I do not consider—and I think Dr. Shahan will corroborate this—the work in Mexico is effective, because the quarantine line is not being effectively held.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Montague, if the disease broke out in this country you would be in favor of immediate action on the slaughter and burial program?

Mr. MONTAGUE. Yes, sir.

Mr. SIMPSON. Now, what does your organization favor at the present time, assuming that the Mexican program has been held in check, so to speak, and you do not want a laboratory in the continental United States? What alternative does your organization offer toward eliminating the foot-and-mouth disease?

Mr. MONTAGUE. The establishment of a research laboratory on some of the islands under the jurisdiction of the United States is fine. We favor that strongly, but we do not want the live virus brought into this country.

Mr. SIMPSON. Under any conditions?

Mr. MONTAGUE. Under any conditions.

Mr. WORLEY. Until after the fight we are putting up now has been lost?

Mr. MONTAGUE. The circumstances may change the position.

Mr. WORLEY. That is what I say.

Mr. MONTAGUE. If it is established here as an endemic, then there is nothing else for us to do. But we are a long way from that point now.

Mr. WORLEY. I know we are, and hope we stay that way.

Mr. SIMPSON. If we established a research laboratory off the coast of the United States on an island, we would have to start from scratch on this program. We can go over to Denmark or we can go to Switzerland or we can send somebody to any of these countries that have been having this research program going on and obtain information within 30 or 60 days. What is your reaction to that?

Mr. MONTAGUE. I think that is fine. I think we should do that. That would be something that I thought had probably already been done by the Bureau.

Mr. SIMPSON. I think there has been testimony to the effect that it has been done to a certain extent and they are prepared to do more of it.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I have read the reports of some of those meetings. I read one report of a meeting that Dr. Schoening attended over there in Switzerland, I believe it was, and I have heard of others that were attended.

As far as anything concretely helpful to the eradication of the disease or the prevention of it, I do not know of anything coming out of those meetings yet that has been concretely helpful. It probably will lead up to something, and I think the work should be continued or even extended more than it has been.

Mr. SIMPSON. North America and New Zealand and, I think, Australia are the continents that are supposed to be practically free of the foot-and-mouth disease.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Well, no longer North America, because we have it in Mexico now.

Mr. SIMPSON. The United States and Canada and Alaska are free.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Yes, sir. I believe in South America, Colombia, and Venezuela are free.

Mr. SIMPSON. What has been done in South America toward research, do you know?

Mr. MONTAGUE. Well, the only thing I know about there is that I believe both in the Argentina and in Brazil they manufacture a vaccine which is different from the vaccines that are manufactured in the European countries. I believe in all of the European countries—Switzerland, Denmark, Holland, and England—where vaccine is manufactured it is done by the respective governments.

In South America, both in Brazil and in the Argentine, it is manufactured commercially by private interests.

Mr. SIMPSON. Has your organization any information as to what has been the most successful method of arresting the disease?

Mr. MONTAGUE. No; the most optimistic statements I have heard are that a vaccine is not effective as an immunizing agency for more than 7 months. I was corrected on that statement one time by Dr. Simms when I made that statement. He said he believed that 5 months would be a more accurate statement.

As far as the different vaccines are concerned, I do not know anything about the scientific differences between the two. I understand there are some differences and I have understood that it was not the desire to use any of the South American manufactured vaccines, that our Government preferred to use the European vaccines.

Mr. SIMPSON. You do feel that this is entirely a reversal of the policy as far as this country is concerned on bringing the virus in for experimental purposes?

Mr. MONTAGUE. Yes.

Mr. WORLEY. Do you feel that this suggestion, namely, the importation of virus into this country, would be a complete reversal of the policy we have followed for years?

Mr. MONTAGUE. Yes, sir, ever since the establishment of the Bureau and the identification of the virus.

Mr. WORLEY. Do you feel further that rather than take that risk we could very well cooperate with other countries which have already done a good deal of research?

Mr. MONTAGUE. Yes, sir.

Mr. WORLEY. That we could set up a laboratory in Mexico or on some island adjacent to the United States?

Of those alternatives, which do you think would be the more productive and the safer?

Mr. MONTAGUE. Well, the two might be different. What might be more productive might not be the safest. Of course, I have had no experience in running a laboratory. I do not know anything about that.

But as a layman looking at it with a little bit of knowledge of Mexico, I believe that the more productive place would be in Mexico, and as a suggestion about that, they say they could not get the susceptible animals into the laboratory without crossing the zone of infection. They could if they would establish the laboratory up on the northern edge of the infected zone, on the northern edge of the zone or in Vera Cruz.

Mr. WORLEY. Sacrificio Island might be a pretty good place for that?

Mr. MONTAGUE. That is pretty deep in the zone of infection now, but by establishing it on the northern perimeter of infection they could bring cattle in from the north and they would not have to cross any infected zone to get to the territory. That would answer that objection that they interposed to the idea.

Then by the fact that in Mexico you would be working with the exact strain of the virus that is causing us the most worry and trouble in this country at this time, I think probably the most productive results could be obtained if you could solve the jurisdictional question of whether the United States would have complete jurisdiction and control over the experiments.

Mr. WORLEY. You have been to Mexico. You know a number of places down there. Is there any doubt in your mind but what we can reach a satisfactory agreement with the Mexican people that we would have complete control?

I think as long as we continue to do things that will help them in eradicating this disease, certainly as far as research is concerned, that they will go along with it. That is what I am thinking based on what they have told me.

Mr. MONTAGUE. They meant it when they told you that, I am sure.

Mr. WORLEY. I think there are ways and means other than setting up on some island. Do you have any particular island in mind?

Mr. MONTAGUE. Mr. Bramblett has been mentioning Puerto Rico. If you are going to work with another country, I think maybe Dr. Galloway's Kingdom of Great Britain might work out a plan to use the island of Bermuda. We would all like to go there.

Mr. WORLEY. I think cooperation with other countries or a set-up in Mexico would be safer than putting it on some island or in the United States, don't you? Do you think Puerto Rico would be safe?

Mr. MONTAGUE. Oh, I think maybe Puerto Rico or Jamaica would be all right.

Mr. WORLEY. Have you given any thought to a peninsula?

MR. MONTAGUE. No, that was a new thought that came in today. I had never heard that thought advanced before today.

MR. WORLEY. I believe it was Dr. Galloway's testimony yesterday that a peninsula would be desirable.

MR. MONTAGUE. That was the first time I had ever heard that thought expressed. Of course, that would be safer than the interior. The report got out in Texas they were figuring on placing this at El Reno, Okla. That is too close to home.

MR. WORLEY. You do not think under any circumstances it should be located within the continental limits of the United States?

MR. MONTAGUE. No.

MR. GRANGER. This is one thing we will not fight to get in our districts.

MR. MONTAGUE. I do not know anybody who wants it in the cattle country. I am sure your people would not.

MR. GILLIE. All right, Mr. Montague, thank you very much.

Mr. Miller?

STATEMENT OF WILL J. MILLER, SECRETARY OF THE KANSAS STATE LIVESTOCK ASSOCIATION AND STATE LIVESTOCK SANITARY COMMISSIONER, KANSAS

MR. MILLER. My name is Will J. Miller. I am secretary of the Kansas State Livestock Association and State livestock sanitary commissioner of the State of Kansas.

Gentlemen, I am very much afraid that I am not going to be a very good witness for you today for the simple reason that on Friday morning I received this wire and at noon I was on the way to Washington. The wire was not received until late that afternoon and I did not get it in the office until the next morning.

The situation that confronts our association, having a membership of 4,000, is that I had no opportunity to talk to the president of our association because I could not reach him. He is on a country phone in the midwestern part of the State. The only party I was able to talk to was Governor Carlson, and he suggested that I come on and gather all the information I could.

Frankly, gentlemen, my reaction since I have been here and listened to the testimony that has been presented is that you people and the Bureau of Animal Industry and we cattlemen and the sanitary officials of the United States are sitting on a keg of dynamite.

I did not realize, not having seen the bill, that there was a question of a laboratory. I am firmly of the opinion that we certainly should do a great deal of research and should be doing it as soon as possible.

There is a lack of information on the part of the livestock people in general, which is not only true in Kansas but in every other State of the Union. They know very little of the serious situation that exists south of the border in Mexico. Having spent about 11 days down there on an investigation tour with four other State livestock sanitary officials, I think our report showed that we figured that the task that confronted the Bureau and its men down there was almost insurmountable. It definitely has been proven to me today that the problem is worse than we have ever seen it down there. Of course, I met

Dr. Shahan down there and got a lot of advice and information from his organization.

Frankly, I think that we should do a lot of research. Whether the livestock people and the sanitary officials over the country would feel they would want the virus brought into this country or not, I am not in a position to state. I feel differently toward it now. I do think we should have a laboratory and have the best scientists that we can find, because I firmly believe that it will not be very long, with the knowledge that I gained in Mexico, before we find it in our country.

Then I think you people stand the danger of being criticized. I think our organization of State sanitary officials will also be criticized and also the Bureau. We are in a delicate position, in my opinion, at the present time. We have not done enough research, that is true, and we should do a great deal more.

Naturally, I would like to see, and I know all of our livestock people would like to see, a laboratory established adjacent to this country some place on an adjacent island or peninsula. There may be danger in connection with that, I do not know. But from the knowledge I gained in the 11 days I was in Mexico, I could almost see and pretty nearly authenticate it that the Bureau was simply up against it with the men down there. I had an opportunity of talking with a great many of the Kansas men in that vicinity and others who were working as veterinarians or sanitarians or as patrol people, and I just cannot see anything but a very difficult proposition confronting us. I think this country should be getting ready as we are in the State of Kansas.

We have everything lined up, so to speak, to the best of our ability in Kansas so in case something should happen in our State or an adjoining State we are ready to move in 24 hours.

Your patrolling, in my opinion, does not amount to very much, because we saw a good many of the young boys who might be on the road or they might be in a tent or they might be some place along the road talking, and I think we have got a tremendous job ahead of us and I think the hazards are great.

MR. GILLIE. Mr. Miller, you said a minute ago that we were sitting on a powder keg.

MR. MILLER. I mean that figuratively speaking all of us are, because this thing could break overnight. I would not be surprised at any time to have a call from the Bureau of Animal Industry to say that it had already gone across the border.

MR. GILLIE. That is what you meant, that the possibilities were so great of the disease coming into the United States that it looked like we were sitting on a powder keg?

MR. MILLER. That is right, and I think we are all subject to criticism, not intentionally but innocently by other people.

MR. GILLIE. That is true. We will be if something is not done, quickly, in the line of a research laboratory of some kind to find ways and means to combat it. Isn't that what you mean?

MR. MILLER. That is right.

MR. GILLIE. And you are in favor of establishing a research laboratory somewhere on some island?

MR. MILLER. Absolutely, and I would like to see it some place close at hand so we do not have to worry about the other fellow. I know

what has happened in Mexico probably just as well as a lot of others. In other words, when you are in somebody else's country you do as the Romans do.

Mr. GILLIE. You made mention also of the fact that you had already made preparations in your State. Do you mean preparations for quarantine?

Mr. MILLER. We have the rubber paraphernalia and boots and so on.

Mr. GILLIE. You would quarantine the State lines; is that right?

Mr. MILLER. That is right. We can use the militia or the local police, but we have checked with the highway patrol and all the police officers so we can establish quarantines and regulations of that sort.

Mr. GILLIE. If I am correct, I think most of the States in the South and the Southwest have already done that.

Mr. MILLER. As I say, I am not unmindful that we may wake up any morning or be called in the night and be told that we have the foot-and-mouth disease in this country. We have already tested, I think, 57 different herds of cattle that came in after the border was opened, and whenever we have any information that cattle have sore feet or anything of that condition we send out the Federal men and the State men go out instantly or just as soon as they can get in a car and leave. We have not found anything.

Mr. GILLIE. But that was before the border was closed?

Mr. MILLER. I mean it was opened intermittently in 1945, was it not? Then it was finally closed by the President's order.

Mr. GILLIE. Yes.

Mr. GRANGER. Mr. Miller, what do you call your organization?

Mr. MILLER. Kansas Livestock Association, and then I am State livestock sanitary commissioner.

Mr. GRANGER. Is there such an organization?

Mr. MILLER. Yes; we have the United States livestock sanitary organization. That is an organization with one member from each State.

Mr. GRANGER. Are they in the main technical men?

Mr. MILLER. I would say most of them are. There are only three States that have laymen.

Mr. GRANGER. They would be better prepared to discuss this than an ordinary layman would be, would they not?

Mr. MILLER. Well, they might be.

Mr. GRANGER. They would be better trained?

Mr. MILLER. Yes; they have got the technical training and most of them are veterinarians.

Mr. GRANGER. Would it be possible for your organization, with the Bureau of Animal Industry, to give the committee some guidance on what should be done as to location? I do not think you have got to convert the committee on the necessity of the research program. I think if it is stopped or delayed that the question to location that might stop it.

Mr. MILLER. I say we are in a delicate situation. I do not think any officer of any livestock association will recommend the bringing in of virus into this country. Neither do I think any State livestock official would.

Mr. GRANGER. I am a livestock man myself, and I have these same fears too, but I am not willing to put my judgment up, as little as I

know about the disease, or about how it operates as against men who do know. I am wondering why your organization, in conjunction with these scientists and technicians, could not give us a program.

Mr. MILLER. I think maybe we could if we had had more opportunity to know something about it in advance. As I say, I came with clean hands. I knew nothing about what was to be discussed, although I recognized the fact that research is very necessary and I think it is a great deal better near us like on an island. That is the way I feel it, not knowing any more than I do. I think there is less hazard there than on the mainland.

As I say, I have had no chance to talk to any livestock men because I think if I would go back and ask them how many were in favor of bringing virus into this country for a laboratory, they would be a hundred percent against it. I think with the proper amount of education and information that they might not still feel the same way.

Mr. GRANGER. That is my feeling.

Mr. MILLER. I am a livestock man also, but knowing what I do now, I think we are going to have to do something. I do not think there is any question about that.

Mr. GRANGER. Mr. Chairman, will you clear up this as to the time of closing these hearings.

Mr. GILLIE. Yes. I will say for the information of the committee that we are not going to close the hearings on this particular bill. I would like to have the reaction of the whole country before we close the hearings. I hope that this gets out to all livestock groups throughout the United States so it will give them a little time to formulate their opinions and form ideas on what they think is best. We want everybody to have an opportunity to express an opinion on what ought to be done in connection with this terrible thing that is creeping up on us.

Mr. MILLER. As far as the laboratories are concerned, I think they would be a hundred percent for it.

Now, whether you can put it in Texas or Oregon or Washington or California or some place like that, I think they would be opposed to doing that. I think the people out there would, without any more information. We all realize that we need research and a lot of it, because if it breaks in this country within the next 6 months or a year and we are not prepared, I think all of us are smart enough to know who is going to be criticized.

As I say, I have always had a very high regard and respect for the Bureau of Animal Industry and anything that they have wanted that looked all right, we have gone along with. I think that is the feeling in most of the States. I think they have been our fairy godfather, as Mr. Montague says. I do not think they are trying to mislead us now.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Miller, is it not perfectly natural for your livestock members and all the rest of the livestock growers of the United States to naturally be apprehensive about virus being brought into this country after all of the years of education that they have had as to how fatal or disastrous it was?

Mr. MILLER. Certainly I agree with you heartily. I think that is the way I felt when I left home. I talked to my chief veterinarian. He said, "Oh, my goodness. I cannot imagine bringing virus into

this country." I said I could not either, but I would go and find out what the situation is.

Mr. SIMPSON. I think it is perfectly clear that this subcommittee wants the advice and ideas of the livestock raisers and feeders of this country as to their wishes in the matter. It is their livestock that is going to get sick.

Mr. MILLER. Well, we have an annual meeting on the 7th, 8th, and 9th of March. I would be glad to talk to our directors and also the members of our livestock sanitary commission. As I said, I had no opportunity to do it before I left. I thought I would try to get all the information I could and bring it back to them.

Mr. SIMPSON. Here is the peculiar thing about this legislation. Up to date, I have had no word from any livestock group in Illinois or the Illinois Agricultural Association. Because of that and because of the testimony here, I am sending this legislation by night letter to them tonight.

Mr. MILLER. Well, I have known Congressman Gillie a long while and I think it is owing to his kindness and thought that I was even notified. I know there are a lot of State officials around us who would have been glad to attend if they had had this advice. I do not know whether they had or not.

Mr. GILLIE. Well, I think it is very important that we keep this open so that we can give all groups a chance to testify here before we close the hearing.

Mr. GRANGER. Mr. Chairman, would you yield a minute?

Mr. GILLIE. Yes.

Mr. GRANGER. I think this is so important that we should not delay too long in getting this legislation through if it is to get anywhere this year. It has got to take wings pretty soon. It seems to me if we are going to get the benefit of the judgment of your people that there ought to be some means for them to either get here to Washington or send a statement.

Mr. GILLIE. Can you call a meeting out there before March?

Mr. MILLER. Well, we could get our directors in, and, more important, our sanitary board. That is the truth of it. After you explained it, I think they could see the point. Of course, there are a lot of these scientists here that have talked in the last 2 days and they are not trying to get us into any trouble. As I say, I think they are all trying to help us out in this situation, but if we go back home and say to the livestock people that we want to bring in this virus, they would just crucify me by the time I got home.

Mr. GILLIE. Mr. Miller, we thank you very much.

Mr. MILLER. I wish I could be more helpful to you.

Mr. GILLIE. You will have an opportunity to come back later if you have any more information you might be able to bring before this committee.

There is one other witness that we would like to hear, and I think we can conclude the business today.

Dr. Schoening, would you like to tell us a little bit about the research laboratory that you have been working on for some time? Do you have some drawings of it?

Dr. SCHOENING. Yes.

FURTHER STATEMENT OF DR. SCHOENING

Dr. SCHOENING. Mr. Chairman, it seems from the testimony that has been given today and the questions and remarks that everybody is favorable to a research program. The point in question seems to be, where can this research be done. When the United States is mentioned as a possible site, of course the question comes into the picture of the dangers connected therewith. It is a very good question and I think one that deserves most careful consideration.

As has been indicated, the Bureau of Animal Industry for a good many years has felt that it has been a hazard to work with foot-and-mouth disease, that the hazard was too great under the circumstances that have existed in previous years to bring the virus into the country. The situation, however, has changed. We are threatened with the introduction of the virus from Mexico, and I think it is a real threat and as time goes on it will be a greater one, so that the attitude of the Bureau has changed on that particular point. Had the situation remained as it was years ago, I think the Bureau's attitude would be the same as it was some years ago.

The advantages of working on an island and the disadvantages, I think, have been discussed by Dr. Galloway. One of the principal points brought into the picture is some of the difficulties when an island is concerned.

However, leaving that point to one side for the moment, we feel that wherever the institute is located, the most stringent needs should be taken to prevent the escape of the virus. No one can guarantee, of course, that nothing will happen. If you walk across the street you may be hit by an automobile, but people live their natural lives without that happening. The more care you take, the less chance there will be of such a thing happening.

We feel that the precautions that will, and should be taken in establishing a research institute should be such as to reduce the hazard of the escape of the virus to a minimum.

We have been paying quite a little bit of attention to just what form such an institute should take. It is a tremendous problem and our plans are only in the very tentative stage at this time.

We have before us here some tentative plans of an institute. We think it is necessary that adequate ground be available and that the confines of the institute where virus is being worked upon should be enclosed by a high fence which would be rather vermin proof.

Mr. GILLIE. What is this high fence you are talking about constructed of, Doctor, stone?

Dr. SCHOENING. No; it would probably be a chain link fence with concrete in the ground. In other words, it would be a tight fence so that no rodents of any kind could get in, or if we were unfortunate enough to get any of them in, that none could get out.

Mr. GILLIE. How high will this fence be?

Mr. JOHNSON. A concrete fence 6 feet above ground with a chain link fence on top of it.

Dr. SCHOENING. We visualize air conditioning in every unit, every building, so that the air would be sterilized. There would be no chance of any infection getting out through the air.

The excretions, the waste waters from the laboratory and the stables, would be thoroughly sterilized before they would be otherwise disposed of.

We visualize a closed unit where when the animal once comes into the confines of the compound it would not have access to the air. They would come in through a tunnel system, which would be closed. This tunnel system would connect with all of the laboratory units, as well as all of the necessary stables that might be necessary to do the job.

The feed would be brought in on a higher level closed system. The animals would be fed from above and below, so that there would be no chance of contaminating the feed as it is brought in. All possible precautions would be taken. Perhaps this would be the most scientifically controlled unit to prevent the escape of the virus. We would undoubtedly go to the same extent as the new laboratory that has been developed at the National Institute of Health for work on virus diseases to prevent the escape of virus infections worked with.

Perhaps for the committee's perusal, it might be well if we could have them look at this particular plan here. You will get some idea of the set-up. This is a tentative arrangement, just to get something down on paper. This part here [indicating drawings] is the compound. It represents this high fence that we speak of.

Mr. GRANGER. How big an area is that?

Mr. JOHNSON. It is about 50 acres.

Dr. SCHOENING. In this area we would have the laboratories, we would have the necessary stables to do continuous experimentation so that we would not be held up by waiting until animals recover from the disease before they could be properly disposed of.

Mr. GILLIE. Dr. Schoening, what are these buildings down here?

Dr. SCHOENING. They are feed barns. On the outside of this compound would be our storage for feed. It would be brought to these points here, run through a hammermill, and then taken to the various units. This is the covered passageway that I spoke of. It is a two-deck affair, and completely closed, both the upper and lower decks. There is no exit to the outside. The cattle would come into the tunnel. From that point on they would be excluded from the exterior. They would live a cloistered existence, in other words.

Mr. GILLIE. The cattle that go in there never come out?

Dr. SCHOENING. They would never come out. The only way they would come out would be through a canning plant that we also propose to have. The experimental unit would probably accommodate 2,000 cattle a year. That is, there is accommodation space for that many, but there would not be that many cattle used because you would have to keep a certain number of cattle before they could be properly disposed of.

In this program there are many things that need to be done. For example, if we are investigating the subject of vaccination, one of the important things to find out is how long does the animal remain immune. That would be one of the major projects. We have the European vaccine, which gives a limited amount of protection. We would propose to work intensively on the development of immunizing agents which would give a longer degree of immunity.

Now, in order to determine whether your animals are immune, it is necessary to hold them appreciable periods of time, and at regular

intervals expose these animals to the infection. In the meantime while these animals are being held awaiting the natural or artificial exposure that you would give them, whichever might be decided upon, it is absolutely necessary that these animals be kept in strict isolation.

Again, one of the difficulties of working with the virus of foot-and-mouth-diseases.

Furthermore, we had the three types of virus that are already recognized. Dr. Galloway's work, since he has been engaged in investigations of the Mexican virus, has indicated that there are variations even within these types. This has been suspected in the past, but Dr. Galloway has quite definite evidence as to the validity of that idea. That complicates the problem still further.

This unit is set up not only to prevent the escape of the infection from the confines to the outside, but to prevent the escape of the infection from one unit to another, which would jeopardize the experimental work. There is no institution in the world that has a set-up of this type. I think perhaps at the conclusion of my remarks it might be well for Mr. Galloway, who has seen these proposed plans, to discuss them briefly in relation to the plant that he is operating at Pirbright, England.

The point I wish to make now is that the most extreme care—and this will take money, gentlemen, money well spent—will be necessary when work is performed to see that the virus does not escape from the confines, and also to see that proper precautions can be taken within the confines so that exact experimental work can be undertaken.

Dr. GILLIE. Dr. Schoening, I notice that you have an administration building outside. This is where the people go in?

Dr. SCHOENING. That is where they go in. Now, there will be many changes of clothing.

Dr. GILLIE. Well, there is an administration building where they stay outside here; is there not?

Dr. SCHOENING. That is right. That is the free zone. When they come into the infected zone they go through a shower bath, change their clothing, and perhaps from one experiment to another there would be a complete change of clothing and the shower bath. When they leave the confines of the compound they leave their infected clothing back and take a complete shower bath in hot water and with soap, and put on other clothing which is clean and leave the establishment.

Mr. GILLIE. Now, people that would be in the administration building, if it would be on an island, would go home every night?

Dr. SCHOENING. Well, it depends on where your island would be located. If the island were conveniently located to the mainland, they could go home every night.

Mr. GILLIE. There would not be any danger?

Dr. SCHOENING. There would be no danger from those people. They would be clean.

Mr. GRANGER. What is all this out here on your plan?

Dr. SCHOENING. This is within the compound, space for an extra building. I might say that these units here are more or less tentative.

Mr. GILLIE. Probably in the beginning you would not have to build all these things.

Dr. SCHOENING. Well, we figure there would be quite a number of these buildings set up. In other words, one of the things that we propose in our research program, and the one that has stymied all work is the fact that there are not sufficient buildings or space available in the present existing institutions to follow the continuous intensive program. They must wait, sometimes for months, until they clean up before they can start again. You are losing valuable time that way.

The point that I brought out this morning was that such a procedure as this, we would hope, in a 10-year period or less, if we are lucky, would get answers which would be of inestimable value to us and that might take 50 or 60 years with inadequate procedures. We always keep in mind safety first.

The personnel is carefully selected, and we propose that some arrangement be made whereby individuals will be employed outside of civil service. In other words, it is extremely important that the individuals be carefully selected so that they are responsible people and understand their responsibility and will obey all the rules and regulations to the letter. Those can be gotten much better outside of civil service than they could where you simply have to take a register and do the best you can. We hope that such arrangements can be made.

Mr. GRANGER. This plan contemplates the feeding of dry feed, does it not?

Dr. SCHOENING. Yes.

Mr. GRANGER. There would be no grazing inside?

Dr. SCHOENING. No grazing inside. When the animals once come in they are in prison, and they never get out.

Mr. GILLIE. That is all right.

Dr. Galloway, is there anything that you would like to add to this building program?

Dr. GALLOWAY. Well, I would just like to say, sir, that in regard to the different institutes which Dr. Schoening has referred to on the Continent of Europe and at Pirbright, one thing I think that has got to be remembered is that the space factor is limited.

With regard to Pirbright as a research station, I think it has also got to be remembered that that was not planned for research originally. It was a set of buildings which was set up in the first instance for other purposes. When the committee was set up in 1924, they looked around for the first possibility of securing premises on which they might commence some experiments, and they made the mistake, I think, now in looking back over the years, of using existing buildings which are not adapted. The result is that a lot of these improvements which have been incorporated in the plans that Dr. Schoening has referred to, it would be impossible for us to incorporate in our old buildings and the whole place would have to be altered.

With regard to the air conditioning, that is a great improvement. We always have to exercise a considerable amount of care in the way we place our animals in the experimental units because of the possibility of air-borne transmission over short distances.

You have great protection with the multiple systems of disinfecting there. The fence, the canning plant, are the types of things that we should want to incorporate if we ever did think of starting out a new research institute of such scope.

On the point that Dr. Schoening has made with regard to foot-and-mouth disease as a whole, we had these different types, which contemplates the problem, and the thing which always holds us up is this question of space. It means that if we have a number of problems to tackle we cannot attempt them all at one time. We have to stop and clear up units which we have been using in the experiments before we can proceed. I think that is one thing that has got to be appreciated.

I certainly was very interested in the plans, even in this rough state, with regard to the safety which was attached to the various installations which have been provided.

Mr. GILLIE. We thank you, Dr. Galloway.

That is all for today, so the committee will adjourn, and we will hold the committee open for further hearings. I am sure there are several livestock groups that would like to be heard.

The committee will now be adjourned.

(Whereupon, at 5:05 p. m., the committee adjourned.)

ERADICATION OF FOOT-AND-MOUTH DISEASE

TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 3, 1948

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE,
Washington, D. C.

The subcommittee met at 10 a. m., Hon. George Gillie (chairman) presiding.

Mr. GILLIE. The committee will come to order, please.

I have a telegram and a letter from prominent livestock men in Texas. I would like to have them both inserted in the record with the permission of the committee.

Both of them endorse the research program.

Mr. BRAMBLETT. In the United States?

Mr. GILLIE. I will read the telegram. The letter is pretty long.
[Reading:]

Representative GEORGE GILLIE,
*Chairman, Subcommittee on Foot-and-Mouth Disease,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.:*

Urge immediate passage legislation setting up research program to develop foot-and-mouth vaccine. Despite protests over establishment of this project in use by various cattlemen we are for it and believe the question of location is largely technical so can only be answered by those technically qualified.

MILLER RANCH.

(The letter referred to is as follows:)

LASATER RANCH,
Falfurrias, Tex., January 30, 1948.

Representative GEORGE W. GILLIE,
*Chairman, Subcommittee on Foot-and-Mouth Disease,
Washington, D. C.*

DEAR CONGRESSMAN GILLIE: May we take this opportunity to express to you the urgency we feel in the necessity of prompt, favorable action on H. R. 5050. It is our opinion that the chance to eradicate foot-and-mouth disease from Mexico by present-known methods no longer exists. If this conclusion on our part is sound, then this Nation is faced with the decision of how best to proceed to protect its own economy. The answer, in my mind, lies in intensive, scientific research through both public and private channels to develop a vaccine which will be effective in the control of this disease.

In a recent address, Mr. George Merck, president of Merck & Co., and Chief of the Division of Biological Warfare during the war, made the following statement:

"The peacetime implications of biological warfare in these years of famine and starvation are especially significant when so much depends on two great foods—meat and grain. Before this work, there was always the grave threat that rinderpest might reach North America. Just imagine what a tragedy it would be if our cattle were decimated by this dread scourage. Today, however, there is no such fear, for scientists during the war perfected a vaccine that assures us against this threat to our food supply."

American scientific genius, under stress, perfected a vaccine for rinderpest. Given sufficient encouragement and financial backing, there is a good chance

that this same American scientific genius might perfect a suitable vaccine for foot-and-mouth disease.

Having no scientific training myself, I am not in a position to express a dogmatic opinion as to where this research should be carried on. It would be my thought, as a layman, that this research might best be conducted on the scene of some present-known infection or on some isolated island. However, the manner in which this research should be conducted and the location site of the research would, in my opinion, be a problem for our top scientists to settle.

In closing let me state that intensive research seems to me to be our only means of salvation and that the rapidity with which this research is instituted may greatly lessen the tremendous financial loss which is facing our entire economy and may obviate the loss of certain irreplaceable blood lines among our livestock which blood lines have taken generations of human effort to develop.

With kindest personal regards, I am

Sincerely yours,

TOM LASATER.

Mr. GILLIE. Now we have this morning some distinguished gentlemen from California. I am going to call on State Senator George Hatfield first to take the witness stand.

STATEMENT OF HON. GEORGE J. HATFIELD, STATE SENATOR FROM THE TWENTY-FOURTH SENATORIAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

Mr. HATFIELD. My name is George J. Hatfield. I am a State senator from the twenty-fourth senatorial district, representing the counties of Merced and Madera in California.

Together with Senator Powers, we have been appointed as a committee of the Senate for the purpose of investigating the situation in relation to foot-and-mouth disease in Mexico, especially insofar as it affects the situation in California.

I personally am engaged in the dairying business in Merced County, operating between 1,500 and 2,000 head of dairy cattle. That is one of the counties in which we had an epidemic of foot-and-mouth disease in 1924. We are rather alert to the situation. For that reason I will just leave you some of the pictures here that were taken at that time in our county, and I would like especially to call your attention to the fact that there is one trench in which there are several thousand head of cattle and 12,000 head of sheep that were buried in Merced County at that time.

For 4 years I was lieutenant governor of the State, and for 8 years I was United States district attorney.

Senator Powers represents the First Congressional District and is the president pro tem of the Senate. He is in the beef-cattle business, running about 2,000 head of cattle in his county.

I should like to make just a few observations in relation to the testimony that I have read that has heretofore been presented to your committee and in relation to the general situation.

Apparently the discussions before the committee proceeded on the basis of the fact that there was a treaty between Mexico and the United States under which the two Governments each respectively agreed not to import cattle from countries in which foot-and-mouth disease existed. I would like to call attention, because it will become important, to certain other sections of law which I think are important in considering the background of this situation.

I refer to section 306 of the Tariff Act of 1930 (found in 19 U. S. C. 1306) that provides as follows:

(a) If the Secretary of Agriculture determines that rinderpest or foot-and-mouth disease exists in any foreign country, he shall officially notify the Secretary of the Treasury and give public notice thereof, and thereafter, and until the Secretary of Agriculture gives notice in a similar manner that such disease no longer exists in such foreign country, the importation into the United States of cattle, sheep, or other domestic ruminants, or swine, or of fresh, chilled, or frozen beef, veal, mutton, lamb, or pork, from such foreign country is prohibited.

Also, section 1593 of the same (19 U. S. C.), also a provision of the tariff act, provides:

(b) If any person fraudulently or knowingly imports or brings into the United States, or assists in so doing, any merchandise contrary to law, or receives, conceals, buys, sells, or in any manner facilitates the transportation, concealment, or sale of such merchandise after importation, knowing the same to have been imported or brought into the United States contrary to law, such merchandise shall be forfeited and the offender shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$5,000 nor less than \$50, or be imprisoned for any time not exceeding two years, or both.

And, of course, our general conspiracy statute (found in 18 U. S. C. 88) also relates to the subject and reads as follows:

If two or more persons conspire either to commit any offense against the United States, or to defraud the United States in any manner or for any purpose, and one or more of such parties do any act to effect the object of the conspiracy, each of the parties to such conspiracy shall be fined not more than \$10,000, or imprisoned not more than two years, or both.

Now, I call attention to the fact that in 1940 the Secretary of Agriculture made a finding in BAI Order No. 373, issued October 26, 1940, and effective October 26, in which he found that foot-and-mouth disease did exist in a number of countries, including the country of Brazil.

In other words, from that date on—and that order is still in effect insofar as Brazil is concerned—any importation of cattle into the United States from Brazil is a violation of our criminal laws and of the Tariff Act.

A similar finding was made in Mexico by President Carmacho, and an order was issued by President Carmacho on the 3d of April 1941 and published in the *Diario Oficial*, No. 29, in which he found that foot-and-mouth disease existed in a number of countries, including Brazil, and prohibited the importation into Mexico of animals from that country, and that order was likewise in effect at all times.

I bring that up for this reason—that I notice that Mr. Worley, on page 162 of the hearings before this subcommittee on the 3d, 4th, and 5th of December 1947, asked Dr. Simms four questions:

Who is responsible for the admission of the bulls?

Whether there was a penalty for violation?

Were Americans interested?

Did the State Department investigate?

I also notice that Mr. Bramblett, on page 12 of the same hearings, asked the question:

How will you react to this, Dr. Simms? I have been told several times that the State Department knew about it and gave their O. K. to the importation of those Brahma bulls, in the first place. Is there any truth in that statement, as far as you know?

Remembering that a practical embargo existed from the 5th of June 1946 to the 18th of October 1946, by the amendment that was issued by the Bureau in relation to the importation of cattle from Mexico into the United States, I desire to call attention to two advertisements that we found in Mexico, the first advertisement appearing during that time on the 3d of August 1946, in the *Excelsior*, which is a leading dairy newspaper of Mexico, and it is my information, although we are not able to verify it—we did not have the time—that it appeared in other advertisements that were paid for by the cattlemen in Chihuahua, the heading of which is: "The importation of the 327 Zebu bulls threatens the ruination of our national cattle ranges, violates our laws and international treaty."

It sets forth in detail the order made by President Carmacho that Brazil was a country—one of the countries—in which foot-and-mouth disease existed.

MR. WORLEY. Can you give us the date of that?

MR. HATFIELD. That is the 3d of August 1946.

I am not going to attempt to give you the complete translation of that which we have had made for us by the University of California, but there was a second ad, a full-page ad, that reads:

The business of the Zebu bulls and the ruin of our national cattle industry.

Also, an ad that was inserted by the same people, and I would like to read a portion of the translation of that particular article.

MR. WORLEY. This is dated the 3d of September 1946?

MR. HATFIELD. That is the 3d of September 1946.

I am reading a portion of it. I am not reading the whole translation but this particular language which I think is of particular significance:

The Brazilian merchants, violating Mexican law and the treaty signed by Mexico, brought a herd of Zebu cattle, introducing them illegally in the country, with the complicity apparently of certain elements of the Department of Stockraising, although it can be proved that the best specimens of Zebu cattle imported into Mexico entered simply and en route to the United States, since they were sold to North American cattlemen whose names we can supply.

For this reason Mexico was in reality a passive agent in a negotiation for the betterment of North American cattle and not for the betterment of Mexican cattle, and this country ran the tremendous risk of an outbreak of foot-and-mouth disease with no profit but that obtained by the merchants who imported the bulls. In other words, Mexico, because of the illegal entry of the Brazilian cattle, suffered the inconvenience of quarantining the cattle; the bother of having painful interviews with Brazilian diplomats, as well as North American; the danger, of course, that the quarantine should be imposed (as it was later); and, in addition, the enormous danger that the foot-and-mouth disease should break out among our cattle.

In exchange for all this the best specimens of Zebu cattle did not remain in Mexico but were sold to North Americans by the Brazilian merchants, who obtained through the illegal importation more than a million pesos in profits.

The absolute reality recognized by all the Mexican authorities and especially by Ing. Marte R. Gomez, Minister of Agriculture of this country, is that the Brazilian cattlemen did not hesitate a single moment to violate our laws and to place the Mexican cattle industry in the situation which now confronts it just so they could realize a juicy business by selling Zebu bulls to the North American cattlemen, and using Mexico as a way station.

Later on they make this statement—that the price of the bulls in Mexico was some \$300 and that they were obtaining from \$4,000 to \$5,000 for these bulls on sale.

Then it concludes by stating:

There exists no other course for the Mexican authorities than to enforce respect for Mexican laws and international obligations of Mexico by demanding the immediate reembarkation or the slaughter of the Zebu bulls or to permit the mocking and violation of our laws by a group of foreign merchants who only think of making fabulous profit by the eventful importation of the Zebu bulls from Brazil which will bring about the ruination of our industry.

Now, we read those articles. We became interested in the question you asked, Mr. Worley, of what American interests might be involved. We just read of certain magazines and publications.

I have one here, and I would like to show you a copy of the Brahman Breeder Feeder, a magazine which is published in Houston, Tex., and I am showing you now the April 1946 issue.

On the front page of that issue you will find a picture of—

Jacarand, a 22-month-old bull. This bull was recently imported by Hogue Poole, Cotulla, Tex., from Brazil.

That is the picture of the bull and the statement that it was imported from Brazil. We still had at that time the Tariff Act of 1930 which made it an offense against our laws for the importation of cattle into the United States from Brazil.

Now I should like to show you the issue of May 1946, on page 39 of which they have an advertisement of the same bull, with this additional statement:

New blood for your cattle will be available in the future at the Rancho Media Luna, of Cotulla, Tex., which is now announcing the importation of the first Brazilian 100 percent Brahma bulls in the United States since 1924.

Now we turn over a few pages of this Brahman Breeder Feeder to page 45, and again we see some more things that I think our committee feels are most startling.

I may say that these copies of magazines which I now show you are our copies, but this file may be found in the Department of Agriculture.

The next issue which I will show you was sent to me by Senator Knowland yesterday. I think it was on its way to the binder's, and so the whole 1946 copies will be there.

On page 45 we have a picture of a gentleman leading a bunch of cows across the Joe Pate Bridge. We have this statement:

Dr. Nicholas E. Dutra, member of the Bureau of Animal Industry of the United States, located at Brownsville, Tex. Dr. Dutra's colleague tells the story about him. He was sent down to Brownsville to do a few days' work, and he had been left in that position for more than 30 years. You will see him here leading these Brahmans across the bridge into Texas from Mexico.

You will also see some pictures below in which it is stated:

This particular bull is a Brahma bull. That is a half brother of the grand champion of Brazil.

Then if you will turn over to pages 46 and 47 you will see the story, and it reads:

Brahmas imported from Brazil.

On page 46 you will see a picture of these bulls with this statement:

Reading from right to left is Dr. Nicholas Dutra, of Brownsville, Tex., member of the Bureau of Animal Industry, who admitted these bulls into the United States. Next is Eligo Garcia with this group of bulls which has been imported from Brazil by D. Guerra & Sons.

These three bulls have been recently imported from Brazil.

Now, if you will read the article, you will find this statement on page 47:

These bulls started on their eventful trip from Uberaba, Brazil, to Texas, September 1945. Nine of these bulls are owned by Garcia Bros., and the other, by D. Guerra & Sons. You have already noticed in our last January publication Mr. D. Guerra and his wife, who had their pictures taken while they were selecting these bulls in Brazil. All you have to do is to go and get your January number and turn to page 73.

These bulls along with some others were loaded on a boat which headed for Mexico, and this boat developed motor trouble. The journey which should have lasted 24 days stretched out to a sea voyage of some 32 days, making it necessary for both feed and water to be rationed very carefully in order to land these cattle on Sacrificios Island near Veracruz.

We had not been able to secure a copy of the January issue which was referred to. As I say, this January issue of the Brahman Feeder Breeder of 1946 is an issue that belongs and comes from the library of the United States Department of Agriculture and which Senator Knowland obtained for my use this morning.

On page 73 you will see a picture of Mr. and Mrs. Ramon B. Guerra, of Texas, standing by a 22-month-old bull.

This picture was taken on November 20, 1945, in the Indiana ranch near Peraí in the State of Rio de Janeiro.

I would like to call your attention also to a rather illuminating article entitled "Brahma Cattle in Brazil," by Dr. Duval Garcia de Menezes, setting forth the experience of Brazilians in developing bulls and cattle in that country.

The most astounding thing we found yesterday afternoon was the stories in the January 1946 issue, called the South American Zebu. This is the statement, gentlemen:

Some months ago we received a letter from Dr. Carl Smith telling us that he had seen a copy of the Brahman Breeder Feeder and that he was very much interested in the same. Among other things that we wrote to Dr. Smith was an invitation to visit the Florida Brahma breeder show, the Houston Brahma show, and the National Brahma show to be held in Baton Rouge, La., in the month of February.

Dr. Smith immediately responded to this invitation and secured the company of Dr. John Viegá, a veterinarian, and Franco Joseph Barbosa, of Brazil. They flew up and attended this meeting.

This is the particular statement I desire to call to your attention.

We had a letter from Dr. Smith about these and other breeders of Iberera, sending 120 bulls from Brazil to an island just off Yucatan, near the Mexican border, where they were quarantined 100 days and then were released to the Mexican buyers. We are informed that some of our United States breeders are also buying some of these bulls.

Now, I refer to that, gentlemen, because that is the first time that we ever heard of any bulls, any shipment of bulls, in Brazil that went to Yucatan. We knew about the 1945 shipment of 151 bulls to Sacrificios Island, but this is the first time we had ever heard of a shipment of 121 bulls to Yucatan, to the island of Yucatan, and we are desirous of having this committee ascertain about that shipment.

I do desire to call your attention to Dr. Simms' testimony, and I am now speaking of the hearings of the 3d, 4th, and 5th, where Dr. Simms did make the statement that there were three shipments of bulls, along about the latter portion of the testimony of the last 2 days, or, rather, two or three pages.

When I read that and discussed it among ourselves we thought that maybe Dr. Simms was mistaken, because we thought it might be a misprint, but apparently here is another shipment of bulls from Brazil into Mexico prior to the shipment in September of 1945 of which we had not had previous information.

I do not know whether the members of this committee have had it or not.

I have made this explanation as to these particular facts because it is our feeling and our belief and our recommendation to this committee that a thorough investigation of the importation of these various shipments into Mexico should be made to determine whether or not there was any liability and whether or not there was any criminal responsibility on the part of anyone in connection with this matter.

Now, I particularly desire to call attention to some testimony of Dr. Simms.

Mr. GILLIE. Mr. Hatfield, that article to which you were referring is on page 161.

Mr. HATFIELD. Yes; that is where I wanted to read, and that also happens to be the place in which it refers to the bulls.

On page 161, Dr. Simms says:

In the discussion of the bringing of bulls into Mexico, the Bureau took the stand, and did not change at all, that there was an agreement between Mexico and the United States that animals would not be imported from countries in which hoof-and-mouth diseases existed, and that consequently the bringing in of these bulls was contrary to that agreement.

We did not examine any one of the three shipments of animals.

That is the first sign I picked up of the idea of three shipments.

There was one shipment that came into Mexico a little over 2 years ago that was not mentioned in this discussion. We did not examine any of these three shipments of animals while they were being held in quarantine by the Mexicans. In other words, our stand was it is illegal to bring them in, whether we examine them or whoever examines them, so we did not examine any of those animals.

Now, I think that the attitude on the part of the Bureau of Animal Industry was absolutely proper and that attitude was one that should have been maintained.

But what happened, gentlemen? I have the picture. Those bulls, and I am speaking now of the second shipment, arrived at Sacrificios Island around the 1st of April 1946, and they were held in quarantine on Sacrificios Island until the 28th of September 1946.

While they were being held, while the Bureau of Animal Industry and apparently the State Department were protesting, while the cattlemen at Chihuahua were bringing all the pressure they could bear to have these bulls returned—and, incidentally, I may say that Mr. Oster Flores, whom you gentlemen have met, told us at that time that while those ads were being run the cattlemen of northern Mexico had placed an assessment upon themselves and had raised 5,000,000 pesos with which they went and attempted to buy these bulls from the Brazilians in order that they might slaughter them and remove the danger to their country from these bulls, but that they were refused—while that was going on we had a meeting in Los Angeles and San Francisco of the Mexican-United States Agricultural Commission, which was a Commission, as I understand, created by the ex-

change of diplomatic notes between these two countries for the purpose of facilitating the discussion and development of a program of interest in the two countries.

Mr. WORLEY. What was the date of the Los Angeles meeting?

Mr. HATFIELD. The date of that Los Angeles meeting, Mr. Worley, was between the 22d of July and the 3d of August 1946.

Now, in the American section was Dr. L. A. Wheeler, chairman, whom I believe comes from California, and who I understand was the head of the Foreign Affairs Section of the Department of Agriculture; Mr. J. B. Gibbs, who is an agricultural attaché at the Embassy in Mexico; and Mr. J. A. Hopkins, who I believe now is the agricultural adviser in the Agricultural Statistics Section.

They had a technical staff, assistants, but those three gentlemen constituted apparently the voting power of the American section.

At that time they passed a resolution. I do not know whether or not you have a copy of this report and minutes of this meeting, but I find this on page 21 of the minutes of that meeting:

Whereas the introduction of foot-and-mouth disease in the United Mexican States or the United States of America would cause great loss to the animal industry of the two countries;

Whereas the Government of Mexico has decided to arrange for the removal from Mexico of a shipment of Zebu bulls now on Sacrificios Island and originating in Brazil, a country where the foot-and-mouth disease is epizootic;

Whereas the Government of the United States has decided to establish on this Swan Island in the Carribean an international animal quarantine station through which might pass animals originating in countries having foot-and-mouth disease or other destructive diseases of livestock not existing in the country of North America and destined to the United States and Mexico: *The Mexican-United States Agricultural Commission recommends:*

(1) That veterinarian experts of the two countries jointly investigate animal disease conditions as they exist in Mexico and as they relate to the recent importation to Sacrificios Island of cattle from a country in which foot-and-mouth disease exists;

(2) That such investigation shall commence no later than September 1, 1946; and

(3) That, provided such investigation produced negative findings as regards to the existence of foot-and-mouth disease in Mexico, that the United States Government should revoke amendment 3 to BAI Order 368, which was the order that effectuated the embargo.

Mr. WORLEY. On page 162 of the committee hearings, Dr. Simms makes the following statement:

A definite agreement was reached that the bulls would not be landed. The State Department, our Bureau of Animal Industry, the Agricultural Research Administration, the Office of Foreign Agricultural Affairs were all present at that time, and the decision was reached that the bulls would not come in.

Mr. HATFIELD. I have not been able to find any reference to it in these minutes in any way, shape, or form, except in that whereas clause that I read to you.

Mr. WORLEY. It seems to be somewhat qualified.

What is your reaction to that second statement he makes? He goes on and says:

We reached this agreement, as I said, in Los Angeles, that they would not be landed. That was with the Department of Agriculture of Mexico, and we were told later that at a higher level the decision was reversed. I have no specific or definite information that it was the President's office, but that was the general statement that was made to us, that the Secretary's ruling was from the executive office.

Mr. Bramblett then asked the question: "You mean a higher level in this country, Dr. Simms?"

Dr. Simms replied: "A higher level in Mexico."

Mr. HATFIELD. I have no doubt that this statement is entirely accurate. In other word, I have no doubt that the attachés, technical assistants of these two sections, probably discussed this matter, which was not in the minutes, but as far as the minutes are concerned the only thing that is shown by the minutes is the fact that this resolution was passed and that is the only place I have been able to find any reference to this particular agreement.

Mr. WORLEY. Let me understand your position today. Is it that someone in the United States violated a law when these animals were imported into this country?

Mr. HATFIELD. My position is that this committee should certainly investigate, ascertain whether or not Americans prior to the importation of these animals had any part in any agreement or experiment that these animals should be imported into the United States from Brazil by using Mexico as a convenient means of doing so.

I certainly think this committee should find out.

Mr. WORLEY. You think that the routing of the bulls through Mexico was nothing but a subterfuge to violate the law we have against importation?

Mr. HATFIELD. I feel that might well be true. If that is true, somebody has criminal responsibility under our laws.

Mr. WORLEY. So far as I know, no one has been singled out for punishment in any way.

Mr. HATFIELD. That is correct, so far as I know.

Mr. GILLIE. The American taxpayer.

Mr. WORLEY. I mean individuals responsible.

Mr. GILLIE. Mr. Hatfield, a few moments ago you read something like this, to the effect that the Mexicans tried to buy up all these Zebu bulls and destroy them.

Mr. HATFIELD. I made the statement; I did not read that. I made the statement that Mr. Flores, who is now the Under Secretary of Agriculture, the head of the Commission, told me that at that time when he was secretary of the Chihuahua Cattlemen's Association, they had put this assessment on and had raised this money and had attempted to buy the bulls.

You will see in that advertisement they referred to the fact that they did have those negotiations. We also got that information or similar stories from two or three other sources. I do not doubt it is true but I am offering them only on the basis of what Mr. Flores told me.

Mr. GILLIE. Who made the statement?

Mr. HATFIELD. Mr. Oscar Flores made that statement.

I would like to come back to this question.

Mr. GRANGER. Just a minute. How much money did you say they offered?

Mr. HATFIELD. Five million pesos.

Mr. GRANGER. Would that much money have been a good price for these bulls?

Mr. HATFIELD. It was not sufficient because the Brazilians refused to take that.

I have a clipping here that may throw some light on this. This is a clipping dated November 5, 1946, of a story by Barry Bishop, staff correspondent, Vera Cruz, appearing in the Dallas Morning News, which starts out:

The diplomatic battle of the Brahmas is over and the Texas cattlemen are arriving here steadily to look over the 316 Brazilian bulls with the idea of eventually exporting them to ranches in the Lone Star State.

Among the Texas ranchers seen at the Serrano ranch looking over the cattle were E. W. McCollum, of Brownsville; Hogue Poole, of Cotulla; Estaléban Garcia, of McAllen; and Richard Oliver, of Edinburgh. McCollum, who owns a big ranch in Mexico, said he had already purchased 20 of the bulls. Prices were said to range from 15,000 to 20,000 pesos (\$3,000 to \$5,000).

That may throw some light on the question as to whether the bulls were worth it or not. I cannot answer that, gentlemen. I do not know what they were worth. I have not seen the bulls.

Mr. GILLIE. Were there any Americans mixed up in this deal?

Mr. HATFIELD. I do not know. I can only say that those names I read I understand are Americans. I do not know. I do not know any of the gentlemen. I never heard of them before.

In the picture that you see here apparently they are Americans. They have American addresses. I do not know. It is something that we feel should be investigated and ascertained and determined.

I would like, if I may, to go on with this question.

As I said, while this situation existed in Mexico, and I am now speaking of August and September of 1946 when our Bureau of Animal Industry and apparently our State Department were putting the pressure on Mexico to keep these bulls out of Mexico, while they were making apparently agreements that the bulls would be returned, they entered into an arrangement for the inspection of these bulls by American veterinarians and I would like to particularly read you the certificate that was issued.

This is a certificate that was issued on the 16th of October, signed by L. A. Schneider and A. D. Wardrow, two veterinarians of the Bureau of Animal Husbandry, and I will not attempt to read the Mexican names. I am concerned with the Americans. I would like to read the particular language of this resolution, of this report. The report is dated the 16th of October.

In conformity with the resolution of the Mexican-United States Agricultural Commission in Los Angeles, Calif., July 25, 1946, recommending that a joint commission consisting of veterinarian from Mexico and the United States make the investigation and report of livestock disease conditions in Mexico, in relation to the importation of cattle from Brazil beginning not later than September 1, 1946, this Commission consisting of four veterinarians, two from each country, submits the following report:

"The investigation of this committee consisted of the observation of the 18 separate lots of Zebu bulls of the group imported into Mexico during 1945"—

That was the lot of 141—

"together with their present contacts, also other cattle including swine, sheep, and goats from the states of Vera Cruz,"—

and so forth.

Now in addition the Commission had the opportunity to observe 316 head of Zebu bulls which has been recently moved from Sacrificios Island to the mainland of Mexico, these bulls having been imported from Brazil during April 1946 and held in quarantine. With these bulls the Commission also served the cattle, swine, and goats which the Zebu bulls had been in contact with for several

months on Sacrificios Island, including some 260 head of cattle on the mainland to which these bulls and their Sacrificios Island contacts had been removed.

I want to emphasize that they said they had the opportunity of observing 316 head of Zebu bulls that had recently come to the mainland from Sacrificios Island. The original shipment was 327. Where were the other 11?

Why were they not examined and why did the Bureau of Animal Industry, the Department of Agriculture, permit this report to be signed when they had discovered that on the 28th of September the Mexican Government was violating the agreement which they thought they had entered into in Los Angeles that these bulls could be returned.

The club that the American Government, the Department of Agriculture and the State Department, had over the heads of the Mexican Government was this practical embargo that existed from the 5th of June until the 18th of October, but nevertheless though that agreement for this inspection had been made which was contrary according to Dr. Simms' own testimony to the policy which I think was a perfectly proper one, it did not make any difference whether these bulls had any disease or did not have any disease, they were imported contrary to the treaty and in violation of the treaty.

Mr. WORLEY. Let me refer to a question that Mr. Bramblett asked Dr. Simms. Dr. Simms said that the agreement had been reached but that a higher level overruled them.

Mr. BRAMBLETT. You mean a higher level in this country, Dr. Simms?

Dr. SIMMS. A higher level in Mexico.

Mr. HATFIELD. That is right.

Mr. WORLEY. What can we do to punish the Mexican officials who deliberately allowed these bulls to come in?

Mr. HATFIELD. I cannot answer that question. I can answer this question, why, if that was true, that agreement on the part of the Mexicans to return those bulls to Brazil had been violated on the 28th of September, they had been allowed to land on the mainland in violation of that agreement, why did they sign that certificate and 2 days later remove the amendment number 3 to B. A. I. Order 368?

Mr. WORLEY. Dr. Simms said further:

There was no change in the attitude in this country on the part of the Department of Agriculture or the State Department, and we continued to protest until we were told definitely that the bulls would come on the mainland, and, finally, they were landed, I believe, the 28th day of September.

Mr. HATFIELD. They did not have to sign the certificate and they did not have to remove that order.

Mr. WORLEY. I did not know about this certificate until you brought it up.

I asked him:

Doctor, what was the penalty for violating that agreement? Is there any penalty in it?

He said:

There was no penalty clause in it. It was simply a sanitary agreement. We agreed with Mexico that we would not bring animals into this country unless we had their country's consent and they would not bring animals into their country unless they had our consent.

Mr. HATFIELD. It was a penalty clause in our Tariff Act.

Mr. WORLEY. You do not take the position that they had our consent to import those bulls into Mexico?

Mr. HATFIELD. No; I certainly do not. I do not think we ever gave them any permission. I think quite to the contrary. I do think we acted very stupidly to permit their veterinarians to sign that certificate and to remove that amendment No. 3 when they had violated what apparently is the agreement entered into in order to get that examination made.

Mr. WORLEY. What was the date of the memorandum to which you referred?

Mr. HATFIELD. Which one?

Mr. WORLEY. The one to which you just referred to, deleting section 3?

Mr. HATFIELD. It went into effect on the 5th of June 1946 and was rescinded on the 18th of October 1946, 2 days after that certificate had been signed by the two American veterinarians.

Mr. WORLEY. Could we see the document to which you have referred?

Mr. HATFIELD. Are you referring to the copy of the certificate?

Mr. WORLEY. Yes, please.

Mr. GILLIE. Mr. Hatfield, what are your views on the problems we have before us now with reference to our research laboratory?

Mr. HATFIELD. This committee, Senator Powers and myself and Dr. Duckworth, who is our technical adviser, are convinced of the absolute necessity of research, all that can be possibly obtained. We are going to recommend to the State Legislature of California, with the approval of Governor Warren, who has indicated to us that he will join us in the recommendation, that the State Legislature of California when it meets the 1st of March, make an adequate appropriation for the Board of Regents of the University of California, to send a technician from the University of California to Mexico for the next fiscal year for the purpose of research study so that if we get that disease in California we will have some insurance of protection, of getting all of the technical knowledge that we can possibly obtain for our own people on our side.

Mr. GILLIE. Is it your idea that you are going to set up a research laboratory of your own in California?

Mr. HATFIELD. It is not, not in California; no, no, certainly not.

Mr. WORLEY. Where would you suggest it be established?

Mr. HATFIELD. We are sending it down in Mexico where they have the disease. We do not want it in California.

Mr. GILLIE. A laboratory that will have to be built for a long-range program, maybe years and years, will have to be set somewhere. You cannot set it in Mexico.

Mr. HATFIELD. Now you want us to give our views. May I refer to the record a little on this situation?

Mr. SIMPSON. Before you start on that question, let me ask you a question.

Mr. HATFIELD. Yes, sir.

Mr. SIMPSON. You say you are not in favor of an experimental laboratory in California?

Mr. HATFIELD. No, sir.

Mr. SIMPSON. Assuming that this authorization passes, and appropriation therefor, is your group in favor of virus being shipped into the United States?

Mr. HATFIELD. No, sir; we are absolutely opposed to that.

I may say we had a meeting, I believe a week ago tomorrow morning, in San Francisco, with representatives of our cattlemen's association and our wool growers' association, the farm bureau, all of the dairy people, all of the dairy associations, and the matter was thoroughly discussed. It was the unanimous recommendation of that group against permitting the virus to come into the United States at all or any experimental laboratory in the United States.

Mr. SIMPSON. Did your group take any action, if any, on this authorization?

Mr. HATFIELD. You mean this particular House bill 5098? No, they did not have a copy of the bill before them and I did not see the bill until this morning.

I know the attitude they expressed. I think I have a copy of the official attitude that they took.

Mr. SIMPSON. But at the same time they did not have the information as to this resolution?

Mr. HATFIELD. They did not have this particular bill before them.

Mr. SIMPSON. Prior to the adoption of your resolution was an experimental laboratory in the United States discussed?

Mr. HATFIELD. Yes, sir.

Mr. SIMPSON. Were they in favor of it?

Mr. HATFIELD. It was discussed and to be located on one of the islands off California.

Mr. SIMPSON. You want experiments and you want legislation but you do not want it in the continental United States?

Mr. HATFIELD. That is correct. May I read the resolution?

In view of the great danger of introducing foot-and-mouth disease in the United States through the importation of virus and experimentation therewith within the United States, we oppose any bill to bring that about or any program promulgated to study foot-and-mouth disease with the use of live virus in the United States.

Mr. GILLIE. Would you be in favor of it on an island of the United States?

Mr. HATFIELD. Provided the island is not located off California. We certainly do not want it down near us. We have lived with it. We have had two outbreaks.

Mr. SIMPSON. Where do you want it?

Mr. HATFIELD. We expect our legislature will appropriate money to the University of California to send scientists down to Mexico to study where it is existing down there, to take advantage of the opportunity due to the fact that the disease does exist down there.

Mr. SIMPSON. Do you anticipate they will be able to experiment with vaccine?

Mr. HATFIELD. I do not know. I would rather imagine that they would.

Mr. GILLIE. The information we have so far is to the effect that Mexico expects to set up her own laboratory for the study of foot-and-mouth disease.

Mr. HATFIELD. It was expressed to me by Mr. Flores, by Dr. Rubio, who is a member of the commission down there, they not only wanted

to set it up but they are anxious and desirous of having this country to help them in that work.

Mr. GILLIE. If the United States is going to set up a laboratory of their own they cannot set it up in Mexico.

Mr. HATFIELD. That would be a question that the State Department and Mexico would have to answer.

Mr. SIMPSON. If in your opinion the Mexican Government did not live up to the agreement on Zebu bulls, what makes you think they would live up to the agreement on the experimental station in Mexico?

Mr. HATFIELD. I think there might be a practical situation involved. I think you have an entirely different administration. I do not know but that is the answer to the situation.

I call your attention to the fact that Mr. Alemán was elected the 1st or 2d of June 1946, but was not inaugurated until the 1st of December 1946, so during the time that most of this situation was developing down there, Mr. Alemán was not President.

Senator Powers and I had a talk with the President of about an hour and a half or 2 hours and he gave us every assurance of his desire in the activity and interest of the United States to help them develop their research work.

Mr. WORLEY. To whom were you talking?

Mr. HATFIELD. President Alemán.

Mr. WORLEY. He gave you full assurance of full and complete cooperation in setting up a research laboratory?

Mr. HATFIELD. That is right.

Mr. WORLEY. By that did you assume we would really have full and complete control of any laboratory we set up?

Mr. HATFIELD. We did not discuss the details of what it might be but I think they realize they are in a desperate situation. They realize that between four and five hundred head of cattle from northern Mexico that would have been moving into the United States through the years are not moving, that they have an unfavorable trade balance that runs I believe, into something like 100 million pesos a year. They are confronted with that difficulty, that difficult economic situation.

Mr. SIMPSON. You know that first-hand information should be obtained from the research laboratories of Denmark, Switzerland, and Holland, do you not?

Mr. HATFIELD. That is correct. There I think Dr. Duckworth would be better able to give you the valuable information.

I call your attention to the fact that there are different kinds of viruses, A, C, and O. The virus we are threatened with now because of the proximity of Mexico to our country is a modified A virus. As far as I am concerned, I should like to see research work on the part of our Government going on wherever the foot-and-mouth disease exists so that we may acquire all the scientific knowledge possible regardless of the expense.

Mr. SIMPSON. Where the three kinds of virus exists is where you want to obtain the information?

Mr. HATFIELD. That is right. I certainly think we should have research in Argentina, we should have research in Brazil as well as the European countries to which you referred.

Mr. WORLEY. Will you yield just a minute, please, to clear up this question of violation of law on the importation of these cattle into the United States?

Mr. HATFIELD. Yes, sir.

Mr. WORLEY. A little research here shows that section 101 of the Food and Drug Act, reads as follows:

Whenever in the opinion of the President it shall be necessary for the protection of animals in the United States against infectious or contagious diseases, he may by proclamation suspend the importation of all or any class of animals for a limited time and may change, modify, revoke, or renew such proclamation as the public good may require, and during the time of such suspension the importation of any such animals will be unlawful.

As I recall, the foot-and-mouth disease was found to exist in Mexico and an embargo was placed on the importation of Mexican cattle into the United States.

Mr. HATFIELD. That was after the 25th of September 1946.

Mr. WORLEY. In October, I understand further, back in those OPA days and the meat shortages, the President made another proclamation which permitted the importation of cattle from Mexico into the United States. He had the assurance of the Department of Agriculture that such animals had not been exposed to the foot-and-mouth disease.

Mr. HATFIELD. That is my understanding.

In other words, as a practical matter, I understand this: That prior to the 25th of September 1946, when Dr. Shehan and Dr.—and I believe it was Dr. Wardrow, if I am not mistaken—certified that foot-and-mouth disease existed in Mexico, there had been no order issued by the Secretary of Agriculture under section 306 of the tariff act, but that the so-called embargo that existed from the 5th of June until the 18th of October was by virtue of an amendment, No. 3, creating quarantine regulations and regulations as to the importation of cattle from Mexico into the United States.

No cattle came in and you will find through the statements of the Bureau of Animal Industry that no cattle came into the United States during that period.

Mr. WORLEY. However, they did come in after the President's proclamation of October?

Mr. HATFIELD. One hundred and fifty-one thousand eight hundred came in, according to the statement of the Bureau of Animal Industry, between the 18th of October 1946 and the 27th of December 1946.

Mr. WORLEY. So far as you know, these cattle were free of disease?

Mr. HATFIELD. I do not know anything about it.

Mr. WORLEY. At least there have been no outbreaks in this country since such importation, have there?

Mr. HATFIELD. I know of none.

I have here a copy of the minutes of the animal industry subcommittee of the Mexican-United States Agricultural Commission. In other words, after they discovered the existence of the disease on the 25th of December 1946, they set up a joint subcommission—technical representatives of the two Governments—for the purpose of working out what should be done. I desire to call attention to this recommendation, which is the last recommendation made:

If foot-and-mouth disease should not be eradicated promptly in Mexico, it is believed advisable that a cooperative research institute should be founded immediately for intensive study of the disease.

I also desire to call attention to another portion of the minutes :

It is agreed that there is only one proved method of complete eradication of this disease, namely, slaughtering any infected and exposed animal. A consideration of this program is prompt discovery and elimination of such animal.

The present status of the disease in Mexico is much more complex than any ever before encountered in any country where total eradication by slaughter has been undertaken. It is estimated that 500,000,000 to 1,000,000,000 pesos, and as much time as 5 years, will be required to effect an eradication in Mexico under present conditions.

Considering the extent of the disease and the many local difficulties that would be involved, it is believed that there is almost no more than a 50-percent chance of eliminating the disease in Mexico by this method. There are admittedly insufficient veterinarians or other trained personnel to carry on an eradication campaign.

Greatly increased funds and equipment and personnel would be essential before such a program would be considered feasible. Any additional delay would inevitably increase the need for essential facilities.

I need to point out this: At that time the gentlemen agreed that if eradication program was not promptly effected, that it was advisable, and they recommended that we set up a cooperative research institute immediately, and at the same time and in the same interest they agreed that the chances were not better than 50-50 for the eradication of the disease by slaughter methods.

Now, I point that out for this reason, that we have lost a year already in research. I believe that promptness in getting research going is something that is particularly incumbent upon this committee.

Mr. WORLEY. Senator, we have lost more than just 1 year. We should have set those up when we had the outbreak in the United States, and had the virus. We are at least 100 years behind.

Mr. HATFIELD. That is correct.

Now, I also desire to call attention to the remarks of Dr. Gillie printed in the Congressional Record on the 10th of February 1947, in which Dr. Gillie refers to the recommendations of the Joint Agricultural Commission, found on page 1006 of the Record, that steps be taken immediately to establish at the earliest possible time a joint Mexican-United States Foot-and-Mouth Disease Research Organization providing within the infected zone the necessary buildings, equipment, and funds and personnel. That was the recommendation made, and you had before you a year ago.

That was the recommendation of that Commission.

Mr. WORLEY. Do you know why that recommendation was not carried out in Mexico?

Mr. HATFIELD. If you will permit me to read the next set of minutes, I can tell you why.

Mr. WORLEY. I think we know.

Mr. HATFIELD. I have here a copy, Mr. Worley, of the minutes of the first session of the Mexican-United States Commission for the eradication of foot-and-mouth disease, held on the 31st of March, the 1st, 2d, and 3d of April, and I am now referring to the twenty-fourth paragraph of those minutes:

It was agreed that (a) no vaccine will be manufactured, imported, or used for any purpose; (b) that no experimentation with foot-and-mouth virus will be permitted since such experiment would be incompatible with the objectives of the campaign; except that (c) such studies or experiments as are deemed desirable and are approved by the Director and Co-Director, will be permitted under closely controlled conditions.

I think that is the answer, that paragraph of the minutes that was undoubtedly put in there by the force of the American section prevented that from being carried out, but that was not alone sufficient because I have here a copy of the minutes of May 6 and 7, 1947, of the same Commission.

They say here that:

That minute 34 of the meeting of April 2—
which is the one I have just read—

is amended by the following addition:

It is agreed that all experimental treatment of animals infected with foot-and-mouth disease shall be prohibited.

Mr. WORLEY. You think that is stronger than the others?

Mr. HATFIELD. That is an amendment, at least.

Mr. WORLEY. You know the reasons why those agreements were entered into, do you not?

Mr. HATFIELD. I beg your pardon?

Mr. WORLEY. There is no solution to the eradication of foot-and-mouth disease except slaughter and burial, so far as we know today.

Mr. HATFIELD. I think it is true that there has been no complete solution except slaughter and burial.

Mr. WORLEY. That was the original plan of the American Commission to slaughter and bury. That is the only known method of absolute eradication. The Mexican and American officials seemed to feel that if we started off on a research or vaccine program at that time, the people themselves would feel there were some way out other than slaughter and burial, which at the time everybody knew was not true; therefore the two Commissions agreed, that it would impair the slaughtering and burial program if vaccine and research problems were gone into, that it would create a false hope in the minds of the peons and Indians, consequently delay or completely ruin the eradication program.

Those were the reasons, whether they were sound or not.

Mr. HATFIELD. At the same time it was stated in their own minutes that they had not more than a 50-percent chance of success.

Mr. WORLEY. The average Mexican did not know that.

Mr. HATFIELD. I am not saying what the average Mexican knew. I am saying as a practical matter that is the basis upon which you have to use judgment, whether, as you say, the reasons were sound reasons or not.

Mr. WORLEY. If we had known then what we know now, namely, that the eradication program would not work out, the committee would undoubtedly have recommended immediate research.

Mr. HATFIELD. I would like to go on and tell you what we know about the question, about vaccine and research.

Dr. Rubio, who is a member of the Commission and a veterinarian, is the source of my information for these statements, that the Mexican Government and Mexican authorities are not waiting for the ultimate consummation of negotiations which led to the Americans participating on an official basis as of the 10th of April 1946. They secured from Argentina a Dr. LeBlanc, who is a governmental veterinarian, who came to Mexico with two other Argentine veterinarians in the latter part of January 1947.

I said we began participation the 10th of April, 1946; I mean the 10th of April, 1947.

A few days later, about the 1st of July, there also came to Mexico Dr. Silvia Torres of Brazil, about whom I think you have heard, who I understand is generally recognized as one of the leading experts on this subject.

Working with the Mexican veterinarians, they began to produce vaccine. The work of producing vaccine began on about the 5th of February, 1947, and I believe that the first vaccine was produced about the 18th or 20th of February.

They continued the production of this vaccine until sometime in the latter part of March. When, at the insistence and demand of the American section, of the Bureau of Animal Industry, that production of vaccines by American firms. It was stated that when the 20,000 doses at a cost of about three pesos a dose, that the Mexican Government had also consulted with some American firms that were producing vaccines in culture, but were looking forward to production of vaccines by American firms. It was stated that when the cattle in clean zones were vaccinated that they have not since been infected.

When cattle were inoculated with this vaccine in zones that were infected, the immunity remained in the vaccinated cattle for some 4 or 5 months.

Now I would like to have Dr. Duckworth tell you about some exchanges of letters that we had—he had with Mr. Anderson, the Secretary of Agriculture. I would rather have the doctor testify to that effect on that particular thing and let him tell you of those letters, but it indicated that the attitude of the Department of Agriculture as late as the 17th of November was diametrically opposed to any vaccine for research and intensive research program.

For that reason, because we feel that there has been too much commitment on the part of the Bureau of Animal Industry on the fact that research and vaccines cannot be productive, we feel that one of the recommendations might—made by this committee, this subcommittee months ago, one of the recommendations made by the advisory committee months ago, one of the recommendations that you will find scattered through the record from Mr. Kleberg and from others throughout the record, that is one of the great needs of this situation.

I again want to emphasize it because it is one of the things that we feel most strongly about, that is, the need of competent topside administrative and executive men to head this program in Mexico. In one place we differed. This committee recommends that they be responsible directly to the Secretary of Agriculture; we say directly responsible to the President of the United States.

Mr. WORLEY. And Congress?

Mr. HATFIELD. And Congress, of course. The idea is to have an active congressional committee investigating the phases of this. We urge upon you a complete investigation of the history of this. We certainly, in California, will not be happy until we know about that third importation of bulls that came into Yucantan, apparently, according to this article, which we never knew anything about. We would like to know whether or not there have been any Americans mixed up in this situation. Certainly, above all, we would like to have this committee, instead of taking the statement that the State Department

made a protest, get actual copies of the protests that were made from time to time as to the shipments of these bulls and have you pass upon whether or not you think those protests were sufficiently vehement and sufficiently strong in virtue of the dangers that were presented.

In closing, gentlemen, I will answer any questions.

I do want to call your attention to one thing. Remember that in 1935 our Government negotiated with the Argentine Government a treaty, a sanitary treaty, that had it been ratified, would have opened the doors for the importation of Argentine meat into the United States. And remember that that treaty rested in the Foreign Affairs Committee of the Senate until it was withdrawn in 1947 by President Truman after this outbreak in Mexico and after we were down there fighting the outbreak with our money and our men.

Remember the fact, that is one of the pets of the State Department, and maybe you will feel there is some reason for insistence in getting the exact copies of the letters of protest that were filed in order that you may determine.

I know you have asked some questions and I say that if you take record of the second, third, and fourth of December, you will not find square answers as to how effective and how strong those protests were that were filed.

I will be happy to answer any questions I can.

Mr. GILLIE. Thank you very much for your statement here this morning before this subcommittee.

Now we want to ask you some questions.

Mr. Bramblett.

Mr. BRAMBLETT. Senator, the Commission that was sent from California to Mexico consisted of how many men, how many actually made the trip?

Mr. HATFIELD. Dr. Duckworth was the technical adviser. Senator Powers and myself were the committee. There were three of us.

Mr. BRAMBLETT. When did you make the trip?

Mr. HATFIELD. We arrived in Mexico on the 27th of December. Dr. Duckworth and I returned, I believe, the 16th of January and I think Senator Powers came 3 or 4 days later.

Mr. GILLIE. What year is that?

Mr. HATFIELD. 1948. We are just back.

Mr. BRAMBLETT. The purpose of this was not only to survey the situation in Mexico as far as foot-and-mouth disease is concerned, but also to make a report to Governor Warren and the legislature?

Mr. HATFIELD. Yes, sir. We were appointed pursuant to a resolution that was introduced into the Senate by Senator Mayo of Chihuahua County, representing several of the cattle counties of California.

Under ordinary circumstances Senator Mayo would have been appointed and would have been chairman of the committee, but he came before the Committee on Rules and said it was impossible for him to serve and he asked that Senator Powers and myself be appointed as the two members of the committee.

Mr. BRAMBLETT. When do you expect your report to be ready for the legislature?

Mr. HATFIELD. We meet on the 1st of March and we hope to get the report in by the 2d, 3d, or 4th of March. We have not yet had an opportunity to sit down at home and write up the report.

Mr. BRAMBLETT. Can you make available to me shortly thereafter a copy of the report?

Mr. HATFIELD. We certainly will have copies so you can distribute them to every Member of Congress.

Mr. BRAMBLETT. Mr. Chairman, what I would like to do in regard to this report, because I know it will include not only information that was touched on today, but information that has not been touched on today, is to have permission to insert it in the record insofar as we can or insofar as the time is concerned.

Mr. GILLIE. We will arrange that at that time.

Mr. SIMPSON. On your trip to Mexico, will you tell the committee your group's reaction as to whether or not the fund this country appropriated for the eradication of foot-and-mouth disease in Mexico was justified.

Mr. HATFIELD. I certainly will and I think the appropriation was justified even if it was several times that amount.

Mr. SIMPSON. That is all.

Mr. BRAMBLETT. Mr. Chairman, I have a cablegram that I would like to put in the record with your permission.

Mr. GILLIE. Yes.

Mr. BRAMBLETT. It is addressed to Hon. Ernest K. Bramblett, United States House Office Building, Washington, D. C., and reads as follows:

With regard project for foot-and-mouth laboratory please receive Puerto Rico's sincere thanks for your fair-minded attitude in stating that this dangerous project would not be carried out here without the consent of our people. After consulting insular agricultural authorities and with most members of the legislature I wish to record our opposition to the establishment of the project in Puerto Rico. We would very much like to cooperate in this but feel that the fact that production cannot be risked in any phase because of the large rate of growth of our population would make it unwise and unfair to our people to take this risk.

Cordially,

LUIS MUNOZ MARIN,
President, Puerto Rico Senate.

Mr. WORLEY. You say you are in the State Senate?

Mr. HATFIELD. Yes, sir.

Mr. WORLEY. What political affiliation?

Mr. HATFIELD. I am a Republican who comes from a district that is 2½ to 1 Democrat and the last time I had no opposition.

Mr. SIMPSON. But in California you can run on both tickets.

Mr. HATFIELD. You can, and I do. I think matters of this kind will not have any politics.

Mr. WORLEY. You will not find any politics on this committee, either, on this matter.

Mr. HATFIELD. Thank you very much.

Mr. GILLIE. We thank you, Mr. Hatfield.

We will continue our hearing this afternoon. However, the gentlemen would like to leave here at 12 o'clock sharp because they have a luncheon engagement, so we have about 15 minutes left. We could use Mr. Powers and let him run along until 12 o'clock and then we will continue with him after and try to convene again about 2:30, at which time we will have Mr. Powers go on again at that time.

STATEMENT OF HON. HAROLD J. POWERS, MEMBER OF THE
SENATE OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

Mr. GILLIE. Will you give your name to the reporter?

Mr. POWERS. My name is Harold J. Powers, member of the Senate of the State of California. I am rancher, raising beet cattle in the northern part of California.

Mr. GILLIE. You are also a member of this committee?

Mr. POWERS. I was appointed a member of this committee with Senator Hatfield, to go to Mexico pursuant to resolution introduced in our State senate to ascertain the conditions of the foot-and-mouth disease in Mexico and the possibility of its getting into California, and report back to our State senate, which we will do, as Senator Hatfield has already told you, sometime after March 1 of this year.

I think that Senator Hatfield has presented all of the documents and all of the evidence that we collected during our nearly 30-day stay in Mexico City.

I feel myself, being a cattleman, and the only business that I have ever been in, having been born and raised in the cattle business in California, that when we write our report and it is made public in our State, that the livestock people of our State at least, probably other sections of the United States, will feel the same as I do in my reaction as a private citizen, that after they read the treaty that we have with Mexico, the embargoes that were set up, that there was some laxity somewhere in our Government and we have to bear some responsibility along with Mexico in allowing foot-and-mouth disease to get into that particular country.

I might state here, also, that we feel in the State of California, and I have recently, as Senator Hatfield has told you, had a meeting with all of the farming representatives you might say, the Farm Bureau, the wool growers, cattlemen, of California, that we are not content, and I do not think we will ever be content to ever consider 1 minute living with foot-and-mouth disease.

We realize in our State, probably more than any other State because I think in checking back it seems to me we had the most serious outbreak of foot-and-mouth disease in California, something like 50,000 head of cattle, that it is very vivid in our minds, and I think I am speaking for all of the rest of the livestock and farming interests of California when I say that we will never be content to live with that disease. Consequently, we are anxious to take all of the precautions possible to prevent that disease from ever coming into the United States and into California.

We realize that we are a border State, one of the four border States of Mexico, and so we take a particular interest in how that fight is being carried on in Mexico by our Government and what precaution we have to take as a State to prevent it from coming in with us.

I know that it is going to be the feeling of our people in the future that there should be some more precaution taken and with regard to the treaties with these other countries there must be somebody responsible some place along the line to see that these treaties are lived up to, because no doubt, as I stated awhile ago, there was some laxity some place in allowing these bulls to come in from a foot-and-mouth-disease-infected country, namely, Brazil.

We have records which Senator Hatfield presented to your committee, showing that there were three shipments of these bulls into Mexico, and consequently some of them have come into the United States, which endangers us.

Now on our trip to Mexico I might say that I traveled over a considerable part of Mexico, probably a little more than Senator Hatfield. He was busy in Mexico City collecting much of these data and I probably traveled some 4,000 miles across Mexico.

As to any recommendations as to where the line should be or where it should not be or whether that is a proper set-up, not being a veterinarian, I do not think it is proper for me to make any statement as to whether that is right or the wrong way of handling that particular disease in Mexico. But I do think very definitely that we should begin some research. It is very evident that quarantine does not mean as much to the Mexicans as it does to our people. The Mexican peons do not read or write and they have little regard for the word "quarantine" and just naturally disregard it.

We have to be very careful on how we handle that particular situation. I believe that we cannot start too quickly on research problems. It is very evident that the killing program that we had in Mexico cannot work. We had to quit. Consequently, when we have to quit and we cannot progress in the manner we have described for ourselves, and we know we have a job to do, we have to do it some other way.

My thought on that would be that we do have to begin research and, as the gentleman from Texas said, probably we are a hundred years behind, we should have started it when it was in California, but we did not. We did not start it when it started in Mexico for reasons given by Senator Hatfield and certainly we should start it now, and I am of the opinion it should be outside of the continental United States and it should be amply provided for with ample finances because I have confidence in the medical research that some development along this line, some assistance in the foot-and-mouth disease might be developed where we can eradicate or hold it in check in Mexico.

Mr. GRANGER. Do you have any recommendations as to the location of a laboratory?

Mr. POWERS. I have not. My offhand suggestion would be to place it outside the continental United States, but I leave that up to better authorities than myself.

Mr. GRANGER. You are also opposed to the virus being shipped into the United States?

Mr. POWERS. Yes, I am. After observing how contagious that virus is and listening to the veterinarians, I would be very much opposed to that coming into the United States.

I do not want to take too much of your time, but I think it is very evident to me as a private citizen that whenever our country goes out of the bounds of the United States that we do so only in cases of emergency. We are only going into Mexico fighting this disease because of an emergency that exists at the present time and I believe I am thoroughly convinced, after going down there, that we should have some executive with complete authority in Mexico, some very learned person, some person with a lot of executive ability, a lot of executive experience, to handle the situation with complete authority.

I think that was in your recommendation of the subcommittee and I want to heartily endorse that plan at the present time. I think that is absolutely necessary from my observation in Mexico.

Mr. GILLIE. Last week we had quite a distinguished citizen from Great Britain before our committee. He is director of the foot-and-mouth research laboratory at Pirbright, England. They do not have foot-and-mouth disease there all the time.

He made the statement that in all the years, I think it is 25 years, that they have had this research laboratory, the disease has never gotten away from them, indicating that it can be kept inside of a research laboratory.

Now in view of this statement, do you still say we must have a research laboratory controlled by this country. The only way we can control it in this country is to have it in this country and not in Mexico. We cannot send our scientists down there to build up a laboratory, I mean a permanent laboratory, probably costing \$10,000,000 or \$15,000,000 or \$20,000,000. We cannot set up that sort of laboratory in Mexico.

We must set up this laboratory in this country, on an island somewhere perhaps.

Now in view of the fact that this disease can be contained, like it has been in Great Britain, with the new laboratory that our scientists are proposing, probably we can do the same thing here so that the idea of its getting away from the laboratory would be very, very small, indeed. In view of the fact that we are facing this emergency, people all over the country are calling for something to be done now, and we have been holding meetings, some at night, trying to work out a way to have it done. We must have this laboratory set up in this country somewhere, not on the mainland, but on an island. Is it not your opinion that it should be done?

Mr. POWERS. Mr. Chairman, it is my understanding with reference to Great Britain that they do have periodic outbreaks of foot-and-mouth disease in Great Britain, and I mean by that: four or five a year. Consequently they are not what I would term free of foot-and-mouth disease.

Mr. GILLIE. They are not outbreaks from the laboratory. They have them there, certainly, brought in from outside.

Mr. POWERS. That may be so.

Mr. GILLIE. That is the statement he made here last week.

Mr. POWERS. I am not a medical man by any sense, but I am definitely convinced in my own mind, and I know that I am speaking of livestock and farming interests in my State when I say this: we do not want it in the continental United States. Otherwise I would have to leave that to the knowledge of people learned in that particular line.

Mr. BRAMBLETT. That brings up a point that I remember: Senator Hatfield reading a statement about Swan Island. That name is not altogether unfamiliar, but I am not able to recognize anything about it in any way, shape, or form. I wonder if we could have a statement prepared for us about Swan Island, what it is, and what is being done there by the Department of Agriculture, and as to its availability for other purposes. Do you know anything about Swan Island?

Mr. POWERS. I do not. I heard the name mentioned.

MR. HATFIELD. May I suggest my reference to Swan Island was with reference to this joint commission that met in Los Angeles, and I am particularly concerned about it. I certainly think that your motion is a most desirable one because I call attention to the fact that what they desire to do is to use Swan Island as a place of quarantine for cattle coming into the United States from other countries in which hoof-and-mouth disease or similar diseases exist.

I brought up the subject of Swan Island and I read that paragraph because it was one of the parts of the resolution to indicate to you that, in my opinion, the Mexican-United States Agricultural Commission, which held a meeting from the 2d of July to the 3d of August 1946, while they did have Dr. L. A. Wheeler as chairman, who is representing the Department of Agriculture, the foreign section, the other two gentlemen, certainly had a lot of State Department flavor to them, and I thought it was more dominated by State Department than it was by the Department of Agriculture and certainly by the Bureau of Animal Industry.

MR. GRANGER. Where is the location of Swan Island?

MR. HATFIELD. Swan Island is located in the Caribbean according to that statement, but I am quite sure that the stockmen and farmers in California would be greatly concerned and very unhappy if the United States Government were to establish a quarantine station on some island or some other place for the purpose of keeping cattle, coming from countries in which hoof-and-mouth disease exists, before entering the United States.

We do not want to see any cattle coming into the United States from any country in which hoof-and-mouth disease exists. We have had our experiences with ship garbage, we have had our experience with hoof-and-mouth disease, and we think if we are going to keep our country safe we have got to keep out any cattle or any meat products of cattle from any country in which hoof-and-mouth disease exists.

MR. GILLIE. Gentlemen, the committee will now adjourn until 10 o'clock tomorrow morning.

MR. WORLEY. Mr. Chairman, before adjourning I would like to have placed in the record at this point a newspaper article entitled "Change in Foot-Mouth Research Bill Urged," by Grady Stiles which appeared in the February 1 issue of the Corpus Christi Caller Times, Texas.

(The article has been made a part of the committee files.)

(Whereupon, at 12 noon the committee recessed, to reconvene at 10 a. m., Wednesday, February 4, 1948.)

ERADICATION OF FOOT-AND-MOUTH DISEASE

WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 4, 1948

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE,
SUBCOMMITTEE ON FOOT-AND-MOUTH DISEASE,
New House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

The subcommittee convened at 10:15 a. m., Hon. George W. Gillie presiding.

Mr. GILLIE. The committee will please come to order.

Before we call our witness, I have some telegrams I would like to read, and I would like to have the permission of the committee to have them inserted in the record. Here is one from Laredo, Tex.:

Representative GILLIE,

House of Representatives, Washington:

H. R. 5050, research on foot-and-mouth disease, has our full support.

Here is another one from Laredo, Tex.:

House bill 5050 on hoof-and-mouth disease has our full support and we urge its adoption.

Another from Laredo:

Livestock committee, Laredo Chamber of Commerce, on this date endorsed H. R. 5050 as introduced. We urge every effort be made for passage at earliest moment with no amendments. Time element most essential. Cattle industry in grave danger, as well as national security.

Here is another one from Laredo:

We are very much in favor of H. R. 5050, for research on foot-and-mouth disease. We hope it will become law.

When we stopped yesterday, Senator Powers was reviewing this situation. This is Senator Powers, of California.

STATEMENT OF STATE SENATOR HAROLD J. POWERS, OF CALIFORNIA—Resumed

Senator POWERS. Yesterday I think Mr. Bramblett asked me about Swan Island, which I knew nothing about, but after listening to Senator Hatfield read the description of Swan Island and what it was intended for, I would like very much to state that if it is intended to use it as an island to hold cattle on prior to bringing them from foot-and-mouth-infected countries to the United States, I would be opposed to that. If it is strictly for research, that is entirely up to your department of government to decide.

Mr. GILLIE. I do not believe our committee would be in favor of that. A quarantine island is just an island. It must be clean, if possible, in order to carry on research on such an island.

Senator POWERS. I think you would have the same situation on that island as you would have on Sacrificio Island. I would be opposed to that.

Mr. GILLIE. Swan Island is a quarantine island? I would like to ask Dr. Simms, who is here this morning, what is the situation with reference to Swan Island? Is that a quarantine island?

Dr. SIMMS. Yes; the development at Swan Island is being consummated for us as a quarantine station.

Mr. WORLEY. Quarantine for what?

Dr. SIMMS. A quarantine station for the introduction of animals from other countries into the Americas. I say the Americas, because according to our original ideas on it, it will be used by both North America and Central America.

Mr. GILLIE. You may proceed.

Senator POWERS. I would like to state further, Mr. Chairman, that in California in 1924, if you will recall when we had our most serious outbreak of the foot-and-mouth disease, and I believe again in 1929, when we had a small outbreak of it in Los Angeles County in California, we had two veterinarians at that time who had charge of the Bureau of Animal Industry whom they thought a great deal of in California, and they were Dr. Mohler and Dr. Miller. I should imagine your committee would bring before you Dr. Mohler and Dr. Miller, and that they probably could give you a lot of very good information on foot-and-mouth disease. They were actually in the field with foot-and-mouth disease in our State, and as I say, we had a very high regard for them.

The people in my State have asked me since this outbreak what has become of those two men, and I think they ran a very efficient department at that time in handling the foot-and-mouth disease.

In closing, I do not know that I have much more to say, but I will again state this, that when we write the report from the data that were presented before your committee yesterday by Senator Hatfield, that undoubtedly people reading that report are going to have a question in mind as to our tariff laws and our embargoes and our treaties, in this case with Mexico, and why they were not enforced.

I think we should have some investigation as to the reason why these treaties were not enforced. If a treaty does not mean anything, we should know it. We have always believed, in our State at least, and I think with the average cattleman like myself, that a treaty means just what it says, that if you are not to have foot-and-mouth-diseased cattle from these countries, you should not have them.

Mr. WORLEY. Senator, I have always agreed with that, too, but when Mexico deliberately violates the agreement, what recourse does the United States have? What action do you think we should take?

Senator POWERS. I would not be an authority to state that, but surely we have some department of Government whose business it is to see that these treaties are enforced. Otherwise there would be no object in making a treaty.

Mr. WORLEY. That is true. Have you heard of treaties being violated before by other nations?

Senator POWERS. With any other nation than Mexico?

Mr. WORLEY. With other nations, including Mexico.

Senator POWERS. I think it is very evident in this from the testimony presented yesterday by Senator Hatfield that certainly the treaty was violated in some respects, that we did receive these cattle from foot-and-mouth disease infected countries.

Mr. WORLEY. There is no question but what the agreement between the United States and Mexico was violated, that they allowed these cattle to come into Mexico in spite of the agreement with the United States. What I am asking you is what action would you take? Sometimes violation of a treaty results in war. You would not suggest any such measures as that, would you?

Senator POWERS. No; I definitely would not, but in my opinion I think if we had called the attention of Mexico to the seriousness of violating that treaty that it probably would not have been violated.

Mr. WORLEY. I was under the impression, based on testimony received here, that a number of protests were made by the State Department and our Ambassador and the Department of Agriculture. I do not know how strong they were. The testimony was that they were pretty strong. It seems to me they could and should have used more pressure than they did. But now what would you suggest to avoid a repetition in the future?

Senator POWERS. I think if you had an investigation of how this happened, surely we would have some means of protecting ourselves in the future from any other treaty being violated as this was. I think had the State Department or our Government called attention of the Mexican Government to the seriousness of violating this treaty and if they did it, that it would probably cause an embargo on all products coming from Mexico to the United States, that they would have considered more seriously before violating the treaty.

Mr. WORLEY. Dr. Simms states the protests were strong.

Senator POWERS. It seems to me that we have a change of attitude in this, Mr. Worley. I refer to the Bureau of Animal Industry. They first refused to examine the bulls because they have no legal right to examine them and they were not supposed to be in Mexico. Afterward, they changed their attitude and examined the bulls as to whether they had the foot-and-mouth disease. There must have been some reason for that change. I think the reason should be known.

Mr. WORLEY. When you were testifying, Dr. Simms, on the point the Senator brings out, did you say why you examined the bulls?

Dr. SIMMS. We never did examine the bulls on Sacrificio Island.

Mr. WORLEY. Was it after they were already in Mexico?

Dr. SIMMS. We had two men go to Mexico to make a rather extensive tour in the fall, beginning in September. Insofar as examining the bulls on Sacrificio Island was concerned, we never did examine them. They requested that we send men down to examine them. We said we would not and we never did have any of our men on Sacrificio Island.

Mr. WORLEY. Did you tell them why you would not?

Dr. SIMMS. Yes; we told them that examination on the island would not guarantee that they were free from disease.

Mr. GRANGER. We could have, at the instance of the violation of the treaty, imposed an embargo on all livestock from Mexico right then, could we not?

Senator POWERS. That would be my opinion.

Mr. WORLEY. I see little reason why we should spend forty or a hundred million dollars in Mexico or any other place else if we have no guaranty that once the eradication program is successful they will not turn right around and do the same thing again.

Senator POWERS. I agree with you, Mr. Forley. That is the point I am bringing out.

Mr. WORLEY. What is the answer? We must find some way to prevent these violations?

Senator POWERS. I am just saying that I think we should investigate this case, and certainly there was a violation of the treaty, and we must have some means of preventing that. As I stated before, I still believe that had our Government called the seriousness of the situation to Mexico's attention that they would not have admitted the bulls. You must remember, and I do not think it was brought out in the testimony, that there was a great protest from the people in northern Mexico on the admission of these bulls. I was told in Mexico that they offered 5,000,000 pesos for these bulls, to be allowed to kill them or send them back to some other country where they could be admitted and given to charity. They were refused.

Mr. GRANGER. For the record, Dr. Simms, how long was it between the time when we knew there was a violation of the treaty and the time when we closed the Mexican border to the importation of cattle from Mexico to the United States?

Dr. SIMMS. I am sorry, I cannot give you the exact date, but we knew in March that these bulls were being purchased in Brazil for the express purpose of bringing them into Mexico. We protested at the time, and we continued to protest, and finally when the bulls were landed on Sacrificio Island, I think about the 8th of May—

Mr. GRANGER. What year?

Dr. SIMMS. 1946. We established a 15-day quarantine on the border beginning somewhere about the 10th of June of 1946. No, it was the 6th of June. That remained in effect up until about the 14th of October 1946. The bulls were taken off Sacrificio Island and landed in Mexico on the 28th of September, if I remember correct.

Mr. WORLEY. On that point, if you will permit me, Mr. Granger, do you think that this Government exercised extent, diplomatic power in warning the Mexican Government against allowing these bulls to come into Mexico?

Dr. SIMMS. Yes, sir, I think we did.

Mr. WORLEY. Do you think it was strong enough?

Dr. SIMMS. I do not know how we could make it any stronger.

Mr. WORLEY. But apparently it was not strong enough.

Dr. SIMMS. It did not accomplish what we wanted it to accomplish. We protested before the bulls were loaded in Brazil and we continued to protest when the bulls arrived at the Mexican port. We protested as strongly as we knew how to protest. As a matter of fact, they remained aboard ship for a good many days before they were landed on Sacrificio Island while they were debating whether they would be landed or not. We continued to protest and it was agreed in Los Angeles that these bulls would not be taken to the mainland. We left the Los Angeles meeting with the Mexicans with the understanding that the bulls would not be brought to the mainland.

Mr. WORLEY. Is there any way you can identify the individual or individuals responsible for violating the joint agreement?

Dr. SIMMS. No, sir; we have heard a good many rumors as to this man or this group of men using pressure in Mexico to get the bulls landed, but we have no evidence in our Bureau that would enable us to say, "this is the man," or "this is the group of men."

Mr. WORLEY. Does our Embassy have that information available?

Dr. SIMMS. If they have it they have not given it to us. I have no reason to think they do not have specific evidence.

Mr. WORLEY. Doctor, suppose we eradicate the current outbreak. What assurance do we have that Mexico will not violate the treaty again?

Dr. SIMMS. Well, unfortunately, I do not think we have any 100-per-cent assurance that it would not happen again. I think the Mexicans will have learned a lesson and will be much less apt to violate it again than they did this time.

Mr. WORLEY. It would be a rather expensive lesson, would it not?

Dr. SIMMS. It has been an expensive lesson, but frankly I do not think we would have any assurance they would have learned it. With the change in administration down there, and with the dulling of memory there may come a time when they would violate the treaty again.

Mr. WORLEY. Do you know of any other cases in which Mexico has been used as a transit point in the importation of cattle from foot-and-mouth disease infected countries into the United States?

Dr. SIMMS. There have been, as far as I know, no considerable numbers that have come in through Mexico into the United States since the treaty was signed. There may have been just a very few.

Mr. FLADNESS. A few Brown Swiss cattle came in maybe 8 or 10 years ago. It was not a large amount.

Mr. WORLEY. What precaution does the United States take in regard to that protection?

Dr. SIMMS. Animals that come into Mexico always come on a health certificate and on a health examination.

Mr. WORLEY. Is it easy to detect cattle that come from an infested country?

Dr. SIMMS. No. We would have no assurance, of course, that those cattle from these shipments were actually bred and raised in Mexico.

Mr. WORLEY. Does the Mexican Government tell you about cattle that are imported into the United States from Mexico?

Dr. SIMMS. They supposedly advise us as to any importations. In fact, they supposedly do not make any importations from countries in which foot-and-mouth disease exists. We know of two other importations of cattle into Mexico concerning which we protested 2 years prior to this time. There was a small shipment of fighting bulls from Spain and another shipment of bulls from Brazil. There were two shipments.

Mr. WORLEY. Did they pay any attention to your protest?

Dr. SIMMS. They assured us that, on the first shipment of bulls from Brazil, this would not happen again.

Mr. WORLEY. That was the first shipment?

Dr. SIMMS. Yes.

Mr. WORLEY. And then there was a second and third shipment?

Dr. SIMMS. Well, there were two shipments of bulls from Brazil. There was one small shipment of fighting bulls from Spain.

Mr. BRAMBLETT. That small shipment from Spain came through Brazil, though, Dr. Simms.

Dr. SIMMS. I believe not. I think that was a direct shipment.

Mr. BRAMBLETT. Direct from Spain into Mexico?

Mr. FLADNESS. We do not know very much about that. It was published in a booklet by Mexicans who were then officials in the Government. As a matter of fact, we do not know when they came or anything about it. That is the statement that developed since all this other situation arose. The protests began and continued after the ships were already on the water.

Mr. WORLEY. Mexico could import any number of cattle from infected countries without our knowledge; could it not?

Dr. SIMMS. Yes, it would be possible for them to import them without our knowing about it.

Mr. WORLEY. The only way you would know about it would be by chance information; is that correct?

Dr. SIMMS. Yes, and, of course, we could do the same thing. We have this treaty with Mexico. We could do the same thing without Mexico knowing about it, probably.

Mr. WORLEY. That is true, but we have not, and they have.

Dr. SIMMS. That is correct.

Mr. GRANGER. Right on that point, we get cattle from other countries who have foot-and-mouth disease, do we not?

Dr. SIMMS. Cattle from countries in which the foot-and-mouth disease is established do not come into this country. Now, this thing has been done, and animals from areas in which foot-and-mouth disease has been discovered have been taken to some other place and held there and then sent on into this country.

Mr. GRANGER. Do we have them come into Canada and then into the United States?

Dr. SIMMS. Cattle do not come into Canada from countries in which foot-and-mouth disease is established. Canada does receive animals from Great Britain. Dr. Calloway discussed the foot-and-mouth disease in some detail with you and I will not go into that. I am sure you are acquainted with the fact that they have had outbreaks, but the disease did not become established. The Canadians required that these animals be held in quarantine before they shipped and then when they come to Canada, after they have stayed there for a certain length of time, they come into this country as Canadian cattle. In other words, they become, you might say, nationalized in Canada. We brought cattle, as you probably know, from Denmark on to the Virgin Islands and held them there and then they came on into this country. That was done about 14 years ago.

Mr. BRAMBLETT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GRANGER. Yes.

Mr. BRAMBLETT. Dr. Simms, do you know anything at all about an importation into Mexico about 1938 or 1939 of some brown-belted cows from Germany?

Dr. SIMMS. There are some brown Swiss that I just mentioned. They came in somewhere around 10 years ago. I could not give you the exact date.

Mr. BRAMBLETT. From Germany or from Switzerland?

Dr. SIMMS. It is my memory that they came from Switzerland.

Mr. BRAMBLETT. Was that some sort of a reciprocal trade agreement where they shipped oil to Hitler and took cows in return? Did you hear about it?

Dr. SIMMS. I know about the cattle coming in, but I would have to look up the record.

Mr. BRAMBLETT. That was a violation of the treaty at the time, was it not?

Dr. SIMMS. Yes.

Mr. FLADNESS. Incidentally, we did not know about that importation until months afterward.

Mr. WORLEY. When was that treaty made?

Mr. FLADNESS. January 1930.

Mr. WORLEY. But you know of four distinct violations since January 1930 and there could be any number of others that we may not know of?

Dr. SIMMS. That was the brown Swiss, one shipment of fighting bulls, two shipments from Brazil, and one shipment of charity cattle for France. We know of at least four. I thought there were some others, but that may be incorrect.

Mr. WORLEY. Any one of those shipments could be potential carriers of the virus?

Dr. SIMMS. Right.

Mr. GILLIS. Mr. Simpson.

Mr. SIMPSON. Dr. Simms, I understand you to say that the quarantine was placed on the border in June 1946?

Dr. SIMMS. Yes, sir.

Mr. SIMPSON. When was the quarantine lifted?

Dr. SIMMS. I believe that was the 18th of October 1946.

Mr. WORLEY. The President announced that proclamation in a radio speech, I believe.

Mr. SIMPSON. The quarantine was placed in June 1946 and lifted in October 1946?

Dr. SIMMS. Yes, sir.

Mr. SIMPSON. The border is quarantined now, is it not? When was that quarantine placed on it?

Dr. SIMMS. The border was closed at 5 o'clock on December 26, 1946.

Mr. SIMPSON. Now, let me get this straight. The quarantine was placed in June 1946 and was lifted in October 1946. Then there was another one put on?

Dr. SIMMS. On December 26, 1946.

Mr. SIMPSON. Why was that quarantine lifted in October in the first place?

Dr. SIMMS. I might say that the first quarantine did not prohibit the importation of cattle from Mexico. It required a 2 weeks' quarantine at the border, which in effect really stopped the movement across the border. That was a precautionary measure. That action was taken because of the fact that these cattle had been landed on Sacrificio Island.

Mr. SIMPSON. I still cannot get clear in my mind why the quarantine was lifted in October and then placed on again in December 1946.

Dr. SIMMS. In October, by the time the quarantine was lifted we had had two men in Mexico, not on Sacrificio Island, but in Mexico who had examined the bulls that had come in on the first importation, the cattle that were in contact with them, the bulls that came in on the second importation and cattle in contact with them, and then had made a fairly extensive tour through Mexico and found no evidence of foot-and-mouth disease being present in the country. Then when the quarantine was replaced on December 26, we knew on that day that foot-and-mouth disease was in Mexico and, of course, that was a complete embargo, then, no cattle could come, regardless of whether they had a quarantine period or not.

Mr. SIMPSON. Who decides whether quarantines like that one in October should be lifted?

Dr. SIMMS. The quarantine was lifted, or announced, by the President in his radio talk that was referred to by Mr. Worley.

Mr. WORLEY. October 17, as I recall.

Mr. SIMPSON. Is the President the one that lifted it?

Dr. SIMMS. But that was made with the consultation and advice of the Bureau through the Secretary of Agriculture. We went to Secretary Anderson as late as 5 o'clock that afternoon concerning what our men had found in Mexico.

Mr. WORLEY. You felt then, based on your investigation, that it was safe to allow the importation of cattle from Mexico?

Dr. SIMMS. Yes, we felt it was safe.

Mr. WORLEY. Did you find any evidence of infected animals at that time?

Dr. SIMMS. No, our men saw no evidence of any foot-and-mouth disease infection there.

Mr. GRANGER. Let us get that straight. You are talking about this quarantine for 10 days, are you not, that was lifted?

Dr. SIMMS. Yes. You understand Mexican cattle could come in during that period, but there was a requirement that they must be held for 15 days at the border.

Mr. GRANGER. And that is the quarantine-you lifted?

Dr. SIMMS. Yes, and then an embargo was placed. As soon as the disease was known to be present, then no cattle could come in under any circumstances.

Mr. WORLEY. That was in December?

Dr. SIMMS. December 26.

Mr. WORLEY. Following the proclamation of October 17th or 18th?

Dr. SIMMS. That is right.

Mr. SIMPSON. And none are supposed to have come in since?

Dr. SIMMS. Since December 26, 1946.

As far as we know, cattle have not come into this country.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Chairman, at this point in the record I would like to insert a night letter that I sent Mr. Charles B. Shuman, president of the Illinois Agricultural Association, dated January 27, asking for their views on this legislation.

Mr. GILLIE. It will be inserted.

Have you had an answer?

Mr. SIMPSON. I have had an answer, but he is out of town. I want my wire to him to be inserted in the record.

(The telegram referred to is as follows:)

WASHINGTON, D. C., *January 27, 1948.*

CHARLES B. SHUMAN,
President, Illinois Agricultural Association,
Chicago, Ill.:

Following resolution is before Foot-and-Mouth Subcommittee. Chairman states ample time given for divergent views. This is a change of policy of Bureau Animal Industry. As subcommittee member, I would like your organization's views, especially as to whether or not virus should be brought in for research in continental United States.

SID SIMPSON.
Member of Congress.

Senator POWERS I have nothing more, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. GILLIE. All right, Senator Powers.

Mr. BRAMBLETT. Dr. Simms, I would like to know if we have anything in the way of information this morning about Swan Island?

Mr. GILLIE. We have been through that.

Mr. BRAMBLETT. It is in the record, all about Swan Island?

Mr. GILLIE. It was placed in the record before you came in.

Mr. BRAMBLETT. Thank you very much.

Dr. SIMMS. Mr. Chairman, if you would care to have a more complete statement, Dr. Fladness is the man in our Bureau who has had charge of that. He can make a further statement. I do not want to clutter up your record unnecessarily.

Mr. BRAMBLETT. Can we have Dr. Fladness and Dr. Simms prepare a complete statement on Swan Island?

Dr. SIMMS. That will be prepared and furnished later.

Mr. GILLIE. Senator Powers, we thank you very much for coming here and trying to help us solve this problem.

Now we have Congressman Lyle. Congressman Lyle, will you take the stand?

Mr. LYLE. Yes, Mr. Chairman.

STATEMENT OF JOHN E. LYLE, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF TEXAS

Mr. LYLE. Mr. Chairman, my name is John Lyle. I represent the Fourteenth District of Texas, situated generally in the southern part of the State and comprising 19 counties. Within my district are many of the greatest ranches, including the King and Lasater ranches, and many of the fine cattle. I believe it would be more helpful if I made my statement in two parts: First, the views, as I understand them, of the cattlemen; and, second, my own reactions to the proposition under study by this committee.

I recently introduced a bill similar to the one under study. My primary purpose in doing so was to bring to the attention of the Congress and the people the fact that there had never been any research by the United States on this dreaded disease. I felt that the time was now that we should give our immediate attention to the problem. Before I introduced the bill, I called the Library of Congress and asked for all of the information available on research of this type. The latest information they had, which was dated 1928, was a very splendid report from a commission sent to Europe in about 1927 by Congress.

The people of my State are tremendously disturbed, not alone the cattlemen but also the businessmen. We live just across the border and are now living with the fear that today, tomorrow, or next week hoof-and-mouth disease will come within our own borders. My people are disturbed because they face an invasion from this disease armed only with the weapon of slaughter and burial. While this method has been highly satisfactory in the United States in the past, I question whether or not we are doing our full duty to our country when we relegate ourselves to this method. It seems highly possible and quite probable that we can, with intensive research, discover an effective vaccine.

Mr. GRANGER. Rather than say, Mr. Congressman, that it has been very satisfactory, you would say it was the only thing we knew how to do, would you not?

Mr. LYLE. That is correct, Mr. Granger; and it has been satisfactory and effective because the outbreaks have been spasmodic and the disease has not become fixed in the United States.

Mr. Chairman, I have heard from many cattlemen in my district on the question of research. They are, I believe, without exception, convinced that the United States should undertake an extensive research program. But all of them—or, I should say a majority—do not favor bringing the virus into the continental limits of the United States for experimental purposes.

I have neither the training, the experience, nor the scientific background to say whether or not it is safe. I would not venture an opinion on it, but I am convinced that the cattlemen in Texas and in the rest of the Nation, from what I have heard, are afraid to bring the disease into this country.

Mr. BRAMBLETT. Well, Congressman, what you mean there is that your constituents do not want you to be a party to establishing a research station where live virus is brought into this country—into the United States?

Mr. LYLE. Yes; that is it. That is the summation of the information I have had.

Now, there are a few cattlemen who say this—"that this is so important that we feel we can no longer put it aside and say that we cannot do research in this country, and we are willing to leave it to the top scientists of this country to locate the research laboratory." I believe that would be a minority view; but, nevertheless, there are excellent cattlemen who would say that.

Now, gentlemen, I would like to take just a minute to show you why my people are so disturbed. The Klebergs, the Lasaters, and the Kings have taken generations to develop their magnificent strains of cattle. No money on earth could repay them for killing those cattle. Thomas Lasater, a brilliant young cattleman down there, whose father was one of the old-timers, has, through several generations and many years of difficult work, developed what he calls the beef master, a magnificent animal. All of the money, as I say, in America, could not replace those blood lines if they were killed off and buried. He feels—and the Klebergs and the McCans feel, and all of the cattlemen, I believe, feel—that this Government should now begin research.

Now, gentlemen, I would like to give you my personal views, since I believe I have expressed the views of our cattlemen. It occurs to me that this issue is so important it cannot be measured by the cost.

I personally would not want, at this time, to bring the fear and apprehension that would now be present among the cattlemen if we established a research laboratory in the United States, or within the continental limits of the United States. I do not feel that I have enough information that I should force that on them. I do not think it would be fair for me to do that. I doubt very much whether you gentlemen want to do that. With your permission, I would like to make a few suggestions.

If they are good suggestions, you may use them, and if they are not, I hope you will realize I am making them purely in the interest of something that is difficult to decide here.

I suggest, Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, that we begin immediate research as quickly as it can be done, today, tomorrow, or next week, in the infected zone of Mexico; that, without regard to what it costs at the present time, we send the best scientists that are available down there and set up temporary laboratories, if possible—mobile laboratories; that the Department of Agriculture secure all of the vaccines that could possibly have a favorable effect on this disease and experiment with them now in the infected zone. I read last night that Mexico reports they have perfected one at the present time which might be useful. I recommend that the Department of Agriculture gather together an adequate supply, or as much as they possibly can, of all of these vaccines and have them on hand; that we reevaluate the possibilities of getting rid of the disease in Mexico.

I understand it is a difficult thing. Gentlemen, I would like to say right here that I think we must understand when we deal with Mexico we are dealing with a sovereign nation. She may not like the way we do things, and we may not like the way she does things, but she is a sovereign nation; and if we are to rid Mexico of the foot-and-mouth disease, we have got to do it with her cooperation. I think we will get a lot further with that attitude than we will with the attitude that we are doing everything exactly right and Mexico is doing everything wrong.

Mr. GILLIE. Mr. Lyle, I noticed in the paper last night that about a hundred Mexican farmers had chased some of the Mexican veterinarians off their places because they were vaccinating.

Mr. LYLE. Yes, sir.

Mr. GILLIE. They are really having a lot of trouble down there.

Mr. LYLE. I appreciate that, Dr. Gillie; and I say to you that, having lived down there for a long time, I think I have some understanding of those people.

Mr. GILLIE. In view of those things and that other trouble that they have had down there, where they killed a Mexican veterinarian, do you think it would be safe if we should establish a research laboratory in Mexico? Do you think we would have some trouble down there?

Mr. LYLE. Let me say it this way. I think it would not be safe unless we do, notwithstanding all of the difficulties. I want to get back to this present bill that is being considered. I think we must take that chance, sir. I do not want to endanger anybody's life, but I think they could be reasonably safe there, Doctor. I have no background to make suggestions as to how it could be done. There are lots of Indians in Mexico who have not had the advantages that we have, and

it would take many generations to bring them up to the thinking of the average splendid Mexican citizen.

In connection with this subject, I think it is important, after you have begun your research in Mexico, to continue your quest for a site for a permanent laboratory. I think it would be well if we could have a commission of cattlemen and scientists to make this selection. I know they could get together on some recommendation for a permanent laboratory. Perhaps it would be in this country. But until we can have some meeting of the minds there, I am afraid the issue would not result in good for the country. I personally am willing to take chances. I think we ought to approach every question of this nature with prudence and caution but not with timidity. Nevertheless, my people would feel better if, in considering the long-range program, we went to work immediately.

I do not know how much money it would take, and I do not know whether it is possible to set up a temporary or mobile laboratory. I gathered from Dr. Simms' very splendid statement which he placed in the Congressional Library recently that much of the effective vaccines were made from killed germs and, consequently, when injected into the animal did not cause the disease. Was that the substance of it?

Dr. SIMMS. That is correct.

Mr. LYLE. It seems then quite possible that the live germ could be handled in one place and the experiment handled in another, if it does not generate the disease.

Mr. BRAMBLETT. Congressman, perhaps you do not know, but it is my understanding—and if I am wrong, Dr. Simms, correct me—that a temporary fine, excellent program has already been started to do everything that it is possible to do as far as research is concerned in Mexico and other places outside the continental United States.

I would like to ask you a question, though. I understand that you more or less would favor, personally, a research station in the continental United States but that does not represent your constituency at all. Do I understand you correctly?

Mr. LYLE. No, Mr. Bramblett. I say that I am not in a position to make a statement on where it ought to be located. I have neither the scientific background for that nor the experience. I said that it is quite possible that it could be here without harm to the economy, without harm to the industry, without harm to the people. Personally, however, I would like to have the recommendation of top scientists in agreement with the cattle industry.

Mr. GRANGER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LYLE. Yes, sir.

Mr. GRANGER. It seems to me you express my thinking entirely. I think it is the obligation of this Congress to do something about research.

Mr. LYLE. Unquestionably.

Mr. GRANGER. And do it now, and the Congress will not have done its duty until it takes some affirmative action on it.

Now, the matter of location, it seems to me, is something that could well be placed in the hands of a commission of cattlemen, scientists, and industry, and let them determine where the location of it should be. I think that is the only approach we can make to it. I do not

think anybody here can settle that question without a great deal of unbiased investigations.

Mr. LYLE. I would be very disappointed if top scientists in the industry could not get together on a permanent place for a laboratory. I do not mind taking a stand on an issue if I have something to base that stand on. I know that we ought to have research. That is all I know. How it should be done, gentlemen, is a matter for someone else's determination. I do not know what you are doing down there, Dr. Simms, but I do not believe that we are going all out and that we have the best available scientists down there. I am reasonably sure that we have not done as much as we could do in this line and I know why. It is because the administrative branches or executive branches like these gentlemen represent cannot handle an issue as controversial as this without some assurances from the Congress that they are going to be backed up. They cannot just reach out in thin air and start something that would create an international situation of this type. I realized, when I brought this bill in, that there would be considerable controversy over it, but it seems to me that there is considerable controversy in all good things. I think I join the members of this committee in wanting to bring something that is good to the economy of our Nation and our way of life. If we wait until we can resolve this controversy in this manner, I am afraid it might be too late.

Mr. GILLIE. Mr. Congressman, do you think the money we have already spent down there has been spent in vain?

Mr. LYLE. Unquestionably it has not, sir. If it has brought us to one realization, that we are past the day when we can safely rely on killing and burying as the sole defense against this disease, it has been worth every dime of it.

I am not going to discuss whether it has been spent wisely or unwisely, or whether or not there was graft or no graft. I am really not interested here in the circumstances under which the bulls were imported, but I am interested in picking up here, from the standpoint that we are now living with the disease, where it can come into the back door of Texas, Arizona, or California tomorrow or today, and we do not want to be left standing, gentlemen, with only an ax and a pit to put the dead cattle in. We want something more.

Mr. GILLIE. Of course, that is what these hearings are for, Mr. Congressman, to see what can be done right now with reference to research laboratories, with reference to how the disease got in here and so on. Of course, that will have to be settled later, but I think our committee ought to stick pretty well to our job and see if we cannot get this resolved.

Mr. BRAMBLETT. Mr. Chairman, may I put something in at that point? I agree with your statement, in general, Mr. Lyle, but I still think it is worth while as we go along to try to get some information and some understanding of where the liability lies so that while we are doing all these things which we have to do—and that is the primary thing—we can try to stop more importations, more violations.

Mr. LYLE. I was not criticizing your efforts. I am personally not concerning myself with that this morning before your committee.

Mr. BRAMBLETT. But you see the point I am making. In tracing liability we not only establish reasons and motives for past violations

but also protect ourselves against the same type of violations, importations in the future.

Mr. LYLE. It is very important, Mr. Bramblett. I did not want to leave the impression that I was not in favor of your inquiry there. I simply wanted to get one point over, if I possibly could, that I am afraid if we wait until we resolve the controversy right now of whether or not we shall build a permanent laboratory within the continental limits of the United States, we are going to lose valuable time, Mr. Chairman. I think it can only be resolved in our way of doing business in America, by getting the scientists and the industry together.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Lyle?

Mr. LYLE. Yes, sir.

Mr. SIMPSON. You evidently, for a layman Member of the House, have done quite a lot of studying on this problem. It is close to you in Mexico. Does it seem possible to you, because of the fact that Dr. Galloway from England has testified here that they have had a research laboratory since 1924, that we could get first-hand information in a hurry from England in that laboratory?

Mr. LYLE. Yes, sir.

Mr. SIMPSON. We could get information over there, it seems to me, from their experience of over 20 years by the time we could let the contract or build the laboratory in this country. You could go on to Switzerland and Holland and get additional information.

Mr. LYLE. Well, sir, I do not know about that. I cannot answer it. Certainly, you would not want to start a research program without sharing their experience.

Mr. SIMPSON. That has been the testimony before this committee. I think every member of the subcommittee, and I believe the full Agricultural Committee, believes in research. I hope they do. For myself, I do, but it seems to me that before we do this, we should take 30 or 40 days and send somebody to England or Holland to come back with some recommendations.

Mr. LYLE. I understand we have some people in Holland now, do we not?

Mr. GRANGER. Will the gentleman yield?

I believe after 20 years, with all their research, all they know is what to do when they get it, to kill them and put them in a pit.

Mr. LYLE. They use a combination, sir. They kill and quarantine in a certain area, which perhaps is the thing that ought to be done, but then they vaccinate in a bigger circle, do they not?

Dr. SIMMS. No; not in Great Britain.

Mr. LYLE. I see.

Mr. WORLEY. Slaughter and burial is the only known positive cure.

Mr. LYLE. Of course, that will cure disease in a human being too, but we seldom resort to it.

Mr. BRAMBLETT. When they quarantine an area in England, it is tight. No one passes that. That is the kind of quarantine you would put into effect on the Mexican border, if and when it reaches that point. It would be tight, would it not?

Dr. SIMMS. I would say that you are speaking very conservatively when you say the British quarantine is tight.

Mr. LYLE. Could I ask one question of Dr. Simms, Mr. Chairman?

Mr. GILLIE. You may do that.

Mr. LYLE. Does this country have on hand any type of vaccine which it could use if there were an outbreak tomorrow in Del Rio, Tex.?

Dr. SIMMS. No, sir.

Mr. LYLE. Does the doctor feel that it might be useful to have some?

Dr. SIMMS. We feel very strongly that if the foot-and-mouth disease breaks out in this country, the best methods to handle it would be to slaughter all diseased and exposed animals and establish a strict quarantine around the area.

Mr. LYLE. What size radius would you use?

Dr. SIMMS. The slaughter would include all of the animals that were diseased and exposed and those that were probably or even possibly exposed. Then there would be a strict quarantine established for quite a good many miles surrounding the area, depending somewhat upon the topography and movement of the animals.

Mr. LYLE. You do not think it would be well to use vaccine on the ones outside, in the immediate area.

Dr. SIMMS. In our last outbreak, we did not have a vaccine. We feel this way about vaccination. When you vaccinate, people build up a very fanatical belief in the success of the vaccine. We believe that we would set up among our own people the sort of a feeling that now the vaccine will protect them. We think the quarantine and slaughter would be the proper thing to use. I might say that is the program the British are following. They have had a large number of outbreaks of foot-and-mouth disease in the last 8 or 10 years in England. They have never let the disease become established, because they have quarantined immediately, slaughtered immediately, and they have not resorted to vaccines yet.

Mr. LYLE. In that connection, gentlemen, if you leave the Mexican situation like it is, then you have a seed bed of infection there forever. That is correct, is it not? That means that daily and hourly, gentlemen, we are living with the disease.

Mr. BRAMBLETT. Congressman, if you will read the record, that was practically testified, that it is permanent or endemic in Mexico at the present time. That is the reason for these hearings.

Mr. LYLE. Under our present set-up.

I call your attention to Mr. Kleberg's well thought out and developed statement, Mr. Bob Kleberg, who is operator of the King ranch in south Texas. Mr. Kleberg says that in his judgment we could re-evaluate the situation in Mexico and with full cooperation of Mexico, perhaps stamp out the disease.

Mr. WORLEY. That is the stumbling block, full cooperation on the part of Mexico.

Mr. LYLE. But nevertheless, we have to realize that we are now living with the disease and I would highly recommend that the United States Government have on hand at least those vaccines which could possibly help in an outbreak.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Lyle, in response to my question to Dr. Simms in December as to why they could not vaccinate in this country, he stated that he believed that the Department believed it was economically impossible for the benefits obtained. An animal is only immune 90 days to 6 months, is that not right, Dr. Simms?

Dr. SIMMS. Perhaps a little longer than 90 days but the usual recommendation is that new vaccination take place in from 6 months up to 9 months.

Mr. SIMPSON. Do you recall my asking why this country did not go into a vaccination program?

Dr. SIMMS. I recall it very clearly. It would be, of course, very, very expensive to launch a universal vaccination program in this country. I think, Mr. Lyle, if you will pardon me, was referring to vaccination in the immediate vicinity.

Mr. LYLE. Immediately outside the quarantine area.

Dr. SIMMS. I cannot understand why it would cost \$1.50 and I believe that was brought out in the testimony at the time, to vaccinate an animal and if it lasted for 6 months a group like the Klebergs or anybody else who had a good herd would not give \$6 a year in order to vaccinate their animals.

Mr. LYLE. If they had any assurance that it would be helpful, I am reasonably sure that they would go wholeheartedly for it. I cannot speak for them on that, but I am reasonably sure that if they had any assurance they would do so.

Mr. GILLIE. Of course, Mr. Lyle, if the Klebergs should go to vaccinating these cattle and sell one of them into another herd 150 miles away and 6 months later this broke out with it, you see how easy it could spread.

Now, hog cholera vaccination, that is almost 100 percent perfect. We continue to have some of the worst outbreaks of hog cholera in this country and are continuing to have them in spite of vaccination.

Mr. LYLE. But, Dr. Gillie, if foot-and-mouth disease breaks out in Texas, there will not be any cattle shipped out of there.

Mr. SIMPSON. Can I ask Dr. Gillie a question there?

My understanding is that under the present legislation or the directives of the Department of Agriculture, Bureau of Animal Industry, there can be no vaccination in this country at the present time. Is that right, Dr. Simms?

Dr. SIMMS. We have issued no regulation to prevent the use of vaccines in this country in a case of an outbreak. We do feel that at the present time in case of an outbreak it would be the most economical thing to stamp it out as it has in the past. It might be that the slaughter method would be very objectionable on the part of the public. We hope that will not obtain.

Mr. SIMPSON. Suppose some owner of a full-blooded herd in this country wanted to import some vaccine from Denmark and vaccinate his animals. Can he do it?

Dr. SIMMS. We would not support the vaccination at the present time.

Mr. SIMPSON. Can he do it?

Dr. SIMMS. He cannot import it without the permission of the Bureau.

Mr. LYLE. He cannot even buy it, can he?

Mr. SIMPSON. Then vaccination as of today in this country is prohibited?

Mr. LYLE. I think that is wrong. I will bow to the scientists, but I think from the statements I have read about it, and this report that I have read which was made by the Commission and this recent report

which you, Dr. Simms, made to the Congressional Library, that they ought to have a definite program. I agree that the only possible way now, if foot-and-mouth disease did break out in Texas, would be to slaughter those in the immediate affected herds and to set up a quarantine; but it seems to me that those in the immediate area ought to be vaccinated and that we ought to have some vaccines on hand.

Mr. GRANGER. We can do that.

Mr. LYLE. We do not have an ounce of it in this country. Is that not correct?

Dr. SIMMS. That is correct.

Mr. LYLE. And you cannot buy it commercially. You have to have the Government bring it in.

Mr. GRANGER. They can bring it in.

Mr. LYLE. They never have, sir.

Mr. WORLEY. Where are the vaccines coming from that go into Mexico?

Dr. SIMMS. Europe and South America. There are vaccines available in Europe and they could be, if we deemed it advisable, brought in and would arrive here in a relatively short time. The European laboratories stock a fair amount of the vaccine.

Mr. LYLE. I do not want to get over my head in a scientific discussion, because I know nothing about it; but I know that a country which could develop the atomic bomb under the circumstances it did, could develop a cure for this terrible disease that affects humanity. I know we can do it, gentlemen, and we must approach it with prudence and caution but not timidity. I hope this committee will recommend the strongest measures be taken that can possibly be compatible with the seriousness of the situation and the dreaded disease. I thank you very much for your courtesy.

Mr. GILLIE. Mr. Lyle, we thank you very much.

Mr. LYLE. Would you gentlemen like a copy of Dr. Simms' statement in the Congressional Library?

Mr. WORLEY. It would be helpful to have it in the record.

Mr. GILLIE. We have inserted that in the record, have we not?

Mr. LYLE. It may be.

Mr. WORLEY. I would like to say you made a very excellent witness, Mr. Lyle, and there were sound suggestions in your testimony. I hope I am not too optimistic when I say that before very long you will have an opportunity to vote on a measure which will provide for full and complete research.

Mr. LYLE. I hope so, Mr. Worley. I think it is a great step forward and I am reasonably sure that Congress will not be niggardly about appropriations for this matter.

Mr. WORLEY. There is bound to be a cure, and it is worth the risk.

Mr. LYLE. I think we are most fortunate to have a man with the background and training of Dr. Gillie in this situation. I have great confidence in him and I will back him up all the way.

Mr. WORLEY. So will the committee.

Mr. GRANGER. Before you leave, Congressman, if you have any doubts as to the wisdom of the money that has been appropriated to stop foot-and-mouth disease in Mexico, the facts are that if we had not maintained that quarantine and taken the precautions we did, the probability is that we would have had it in the United States. I think

unequivocally we can say that the 40 million or whatever we have spent has been wisely spent.

Mr. LYLE. I thought I said that, Mr. Granger. I meant to.

Mr. GRANGER. I did not understand you to say that.

Mr. LYLE. I meant to say it, and I believe it sincerely. Is this report of yours in the record, Dr. Simms?

Dr. SIMMS. I think that has been filed with the committee. If it has not, I will be glad to furnish copies.

Mr. LYLE. Thank you very much, Dr. Gillie.

Mr. GILLIE. The next speaker is Dr. Duckworth. Dr. Duckworth is the assistant director in the department of agriculture in California, is that correct?

Dr. DUCKWORTH. That is correct.

STATEMENT OF DR. DUCKWORTH, ASSISTANT DIRECTOR, DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE IN CALIFORNIA

Dr. DUCKWORTH. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I am Charles U. Duckworth, assistant director of the California Department of Agriculture.

Mr. Chairman, I could very well say, "Amen" to practically everything the previous speaker said and sit down and save a lot of work on the part of the committee and myself, but there are a few extra points I would like to touch upon.

I think he brought out some very significant things and I want to go just a little bit afield for the sake of comparison. The comparison is not exactly apt, but it indicates progress along certain lines. It is not too many years ago when we were talking about the control of what was then Bang's disease and is now brucellosis, that the only method of doing the job was by slaughter. Some very commendable work was done by the scientists of the Bureau of Animal Industry and a vaccine was developed. In California we resisted the slaughter program on Bang's disease and there have been no cattle killed on a program of slaughter and indemnity in that State, and we think we have made a very forward move. At the last session of the legislature, money was appropriated whereby it is now compulsory in California to vaccinate all dairy heifer calves at the expense of the State. Beef calves may be vaccinated optionally. If the grower wants his calves vaccinated, we shall do so. I merely point that out in keeping with what the former speaker said about progress and looking for something better than slaughter.

You have to take into consideration that those of us who opposed the slaughter program felt that progress was necessary in the line of immunization rather than slaughter and we contrast this one with a disease that is not established in the United States. On the other hand, we must agree with what has been stated here, that it is established in Mexico and there were some of us, at least, who felt it was established in Mexico when we got on the job. In connection with the theories of research, I would like to present, Mr. Chairman, the foot-and-mouth-disease resolutions as adopted by the advisory committee in which we stated on the 6th of December when these recommendations were given to Secretary Anderson:

The development of research program outside the continental United States to study the disease and the use of vaccines. The preparations of vaccines not

harmful in spreading the disease wholly to be used as an aid to control during and in conjunction with the eradication program.

This has other provisions and other recommendations. I would like to present that, if I may, Mr. Chairman, for inclusion in your record.

Mr. GILLIE. Is this the resolution that was adopted by the research committee?

Dr. DUCKWORTH. No; that is a resolution by the foot-and-mouth advisory committee to the Secretary. This is not the scientific committee.

Mr. GILLIE. All right. With the permission of the committee, we will have it inserted in the record.

(The resolution referred to is as follows:)

Be it resolved, That we make the following recommendations to the President and Congress of the United States relative to the control and eradication of foot-and-mouth disease in the Republic of Mexico and urge that the Secretary of Agriculture do everything within his power to carry out the following program:

1. Immediate renegotiations between this country and Mexico at highest ranking levels. The purpose of the negotiations to develop a practical and efficient program along recognized and accepted lines for the complete eradication of foot-and-mouth disease in Mexico.

2. The appointment of an administrator of unquestioned ability with complete authority over all operations, reporting directly to the President and the departments indicated by him.

3. The appointment of the most competent scientist available to the Secretary of Agriculture to coordinate and conduct field operations; working always in close cooperation with the administrator where the technical work involves questions of policy.

4. The employment of personnel best qualified to carry on the work regardless of rank, civil-service rating, or length of service.

5. Assurances that during the negotiations and at all times thereafter until the disease is completely eradicated the program will have the full unqualified support of all departments of government.

6. The development of research program outside the continental United States to study the disease and the use of vaccines. The preparation of vaccines, not harmful in spreading the disease, to be used solely as an aid to control during and in conjunction with the eradication program.

7. A study of the economic impact on the Mexican Government and the Mexican people.

8. The construction of a fence on the international boundary at the earliest date possible. The immediate construction of an adequate fence along the present quarantine line within Mexico.

9. The continuation of the canning program in the clean States of northern Mexico and all technical help necessary to implement the completion of plants now under construction.

10. A request be made of Congress for authority to do all things herein recommended and that funds be provided to carry on the operations of the program in all of its phases.

Dr. DUCKWORTH. In speaking of this bill, 5098, I would like to merely say it is my opinion that we should have research in the United States or we should not have research in the United States and sit down. But, the whole program in Mexico and there too, because the livestock-disease men, using the words "foot-and-mouth disease," and the press insist on using the words "hoof-and-mouth disease." I think it would be a fine thing if we would settle on the simpler term of "aftosa", as used in Mexico.

The entire program is so inseparable from research that it seems to me we must go a little bit into the past and see what has been done in order to determine what we are going to do. Just a year ago I was in

Washington and we were discussing the situation in Mexico and I returned to California and I submitted a report to the director of agriculture there. I will not read it all. It is rather lengthy. I would like to read a paragraph, if I may. [Reading:]

In contemplating the problems, one cannot be too optimistic about the outcome. If it is necessary to completely liquidate all susceptible animals within the zone, the question arises naturally, is it physically possible to do so? In considering this, one must take into consideration that we would be working in a foreign country where we do not understand the government as we do our own, and could rightfully contemplate that we would not have the same measure of impartiality and law enforcement.

Further, the attitude of the people must be taken into consideration as well as the terrific effect on their lives the proposed program would have. That part of their agriculture geared to the work of oxen must, of necessity, be seriously interfered with. The possibility and probability of slaughtering susceptible animals which have recovered from the disease is problematical. We are advised that there are representatives from other governments in Mexico advising against our slaughter method and advocating treatment.

I merely read that to indicate that some of us felt way back there in the beginning that there was a very serious question as to whether the job of slaughter as conducted in this country could be done. We have listened to statements here that we felt we only had a 50-50 chance when we went down there, and in my opinion it should have been appreciated that you did not have a 50-50 chance. You had practically no chance at all. If that were true, then it would seem to me highly desirable that research should have been going on in Mexico but it was steadfastly resisted by our Government. As to whether or not you had an opportunity to do the job, I would like to set forth a few very pertinent observations.

The United States Department of Agriculture Circular 325 deals with foot-and-mouth disease in 1914 and points out some very pertinent things. It states that of 3,556 infected herds, 605 were infected through virus carried upon shoes, clothing, or bodies of persons and that of 814 unknown cases it is probable that a considerable proportion were infected in this way, making more than 1 out of 6 of the total infections the result of this method of transmission. It also states that the infective agent may be spread so readily that it is difficult to prevent its dissemination even where animals are confined in tight sanitary buildings with the most careful use of disinfectants and surrounded by guards. Technical Bulletin No. 76 points out that the infected material can survive in earth for at least 25 to 30 days. It goes on and points out experiments wherein soil was impregnated with the virus and then tested on animals and it was found that the virus did live up to this length of time. The experiments were discontinued. Contrast that information as published in our governmental bulletins with the situation in Mexico that you gentlemen saw.

MR. GRANGER. What is the date of that?

DR. DUCKWORTH. August 11. Contrast that with what you gentlemen saw in Mexico where there were places where cattle were to be slaughtered, and people were milling around those places by the hundreds. If one of the principal ways of dissemination in the United States was on the clothing and shoes of people, surely we could not have felt we had a 50-50 chance in Mexico with people milling around those places and going home to their own villages or wherever they wanted to go.

I point that out merely to indicate that the impossibility of the success of the program should have been recognized sooner and that research work should have been going on in Mexico. The Mexican people, we are informed, favored some work there and they were even making vaccine. They were instructed to discontinue making it. As to the use of the vaccine then in the United States—I appreciate this is getting slightly away from the immediate subject, Mr. Chairman, but I think it is very pertinent in view of the fact that questions have been brought up about it.

In letters to Mr. Albert Mitchell, who is chairman of the advisory committee, under date of August 31 and under date of August 8, 1947—

Mr. GRANGER. What was the date of the bulletin you previously read from?

Dr. DUCKWORTH. I do not know the date of it. The technical bulletin I had reference to was the one mentioned by the preceding speaker of June 1928. The date of the Farmers' Bulletin, I think the last revision, was in 1938. It is Farmers' Bulletin 666, and is available in the record. I pointed out in these letters, without reading them and putting too much material into the file, that it was my opinion that we should have someone going to Switzerland. I say I am firmly of the opinion that the vaccination program as carried on in Switzerland together with the slaughter of infected animals should be investigated and studied as thoroughly at as early a date as possible. The very thought of vaccination seems to be frowned upon by some of our top-flight Government disease-control men, but I cannot emphasize too strongly that it is my personal opinion that vaccination as an aid in eradication in Mexico is a great aid and considered so by leading scientists.

These letters were sent on to Secretary Anderson as indicated by a reply I have here from Mr. Anderson in which he sets forth some very pertinent statements. I would like to read a portion of it, if I may. Mr. Anderson says in part, eradication measures are so harsh in their application that everyone cries out for a different method and particularly for the use of modern methods rather than the old methods developed before medical science had progressed to its present levels. We fully appreciate the reasoning behind such urging. It does seem that medical science would have found a way to eradicate a disease such as foot-and-mouth disease without using the slaughter method.

Obviously it would be an easy decision for the Bureau of Animal Industry to take credit for a more progressive stand and use the latest experimental knowledge in fostering vaccination. However, the practical experience gained in fighting this disease, not only in several outbreaks in the United States but also in many other countries of the world, do not show that the vaccination method will eradicate the disease. "Eradicate" is underscored. Whereas it has been demonstrated time and again that the slaughter method will establish this purpose, your personal experience in outbreaks in California serve very well to illustrate what can be accomplished with the slaughter method. With particular respect to the Mexican situation, we quote below a paragraph from a memorandum transmitted to the Department of State on August 13 in reply to inquiries from the Mexican Government relative to the use of vaccines in that program, and the

question of the use of vaccine has been approached carefully, keeping in mind clearly the goal which is the complete eradication of the disease in Mexico. Scientific experimentation does not indicate that this goal can be achieved with vaccination alone and the experience of many years with this procedure in many countries of the world shows clearly that vaccination alone is incapable of bringing about eradication.

With respect to using vaccine concurrently with the slaughter method, the research to date in England and on virus found in Mexico does not show that vaccine in use in other countries have ability to properly immunize against it. Also it is believed that resistance to the slaughter and burial of exposed animals would be heightened through the use of vaccines so that eradication would be long delayed if not entirely forestalled. The nature of foot-and-mouth disease and the effects of use of vaccines are such that a livestock owner probably would be convinced after early observation of the use of the vaccine that such use furnishes an answer to his problem and he and his neighbors would thereafter be set against the slaughter method. Then it is reasonable to expect that this conviction would spread rapidly throughout the infected areas of Mexico, soon bringing the eradication campaign to a halt. The result would be that the vaccination method alone would be used; and all evidence points then to the permanent existence of the disease in that area, although the vaccines probably would reduce losses from the disease.

Full realization of the bad effects produced by the continuation of the disease would not come to the individual owner until they had lived with it for many months. After that length of time it would be too late to again take up the slaughter method to eradicate the disease. For these reasons, the Department of Agriculture is unable to endorse the use of foot-and-mouth disease vaccines in the eradication campaign. It may be well at this point to emphasize that the Department of Agriculture has authority to spend funds for the eradication of the disease in Mexico only along the lines agreed upon in exchange of diplomatic notes between the two governments on March 17 and 18 of this year. Clearly these notes and the action taken by the Joint Commission, the Mexican Government, the Department, and the United States Congress in reliance thereon provide only for a program that will insure complete eradication of the disease. Any major deviation from such a program appears to be unauthorized.

Now, in connection with that statement, I would like to read just a few lines from Public Law No. 8 under date of February 28 in which we find these words:

The Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to cooperate with the Government of Mexico carrying out operations or measures to eradicate, suppress, or control or to prevent or retard foot-and-mouth disease or rinderpest in Mexico where he deems such action necessary to protect the livestock and related industries of the United States.

Mr. SIMPSON. Could I ask a question right there?

You mentioned rinderpest. That pertains to hogs, does it not?

Dr. DUCKWORTH. Yes, sir.

Mr. SIMPSON. Practically all the testimony before this subcommittee has been relative to cattle. I have heard very, very little testimony relating to anything on the hog situation.

Dr. DUCKWORTH. Well, it says to protect livestock here. You do not hear very much because, after all, Mexico is not a swine-producing country. Of course, where you are talking about foot-and-mouth disease, you must include all susceptible animals, so where you are speaking of cattle, you in substance are talking about hogs as well.

Mr. SIMPSON. Were you in Mexico?

Dr. DUCKWORTH. Yes, sir.

Mr. SIMPSON. Did you notice the hogs having foot-and-mouth disease?

Dr. DUCKWORTH. I did not see any hogs affected at all; no, sir; although I will have to say in that connection that I do not think I saw more than a couple of hundred hogs, one here and two there, and one some place else. They were not prevalent like cattle were. They were scavengers tied up around somebody's little living accommodations. In bringing that to your attention, Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, I do it for the purpose of indicating that if the law means what it says that you could suppress or retard, that there was nothing in the world to prevent the use of vaccine or some study with the exception of policy.

Now, getting back closely here to your bill in question, for many, many years the Department of Agriculture has advised against the use of virus of foot-and-mouth disease in this country for research purposes. Agriculture in this country is so thoroughly sold on the idea that you cannot keep that virus confined that a bill to conduct research within the United States came as a distinct and decided shock. The Bureau has done a fine job over many years in selling us that idea. It is not an idea that was many years old and discontinued. To those of us who felt that research on the disease and the possible use of vaccination should be studied in Mexico, publicity was released, and I recall particularly in July and August and November of 1947 I heard it on the radio, information to the effect that work of that nature in Mexico was inadvisable because of the extreme difficulty of keeping the virus from escaping and infecting livestock.

If that were true in July, August, and November of last year, it seems to us in agriculture that it would be equally true in January or February of 1948. I wish I could have been here to have heard Dr. Galloway. I think very highly of Dr. Galloway as a research scientist. I was not here, and I can only go on hearsay as to what I heard, that the virus had not escaped from the laboratories in England. It is the most difficult thing, gentlemen, to absolutely place responsibility for many outbreaks of foot-and-mouth disease on individual premises. Maybe some of the numerous premises affected in England annually could have come from that laboratory. We say if we are going to say that that is true, then I think we must also recognize the statement in the report of Dr. Schoening, who has recently returned from Europe and also whom I regard very highly and as one of the leading scientists on this disease in the world.

He says in his report that there is no foot-and-mouth disease in Denmark, that Denmark has discontinued the manufacture of vaccine at the present time because it has a surplus on hand. Now, what became of the disease? Maybe they have done a pretty good job in Denmark. There are those who say there is no recurrence in Denmark; that is all. Maybe that is true. On the other hand, maybe it is gone, and when it shows up again in Denmark it may come from some of the

other countries that are not doing as good a job. Those countries in Europe are surrounded by people who do not get together on a constructive, coordinated program; and it could well be that if a country like Switzerland, which has done a fine job with the slaughter and vaccination program, a program that we are in substance talking about in Mexico at the present time, was situated like Mexico and was not surrounded with infected countries they could clean up their situation with vaccination and quarantine.

We are stuck with the necessity of trying it in Mexico; and while we are trying it I cannot urge too strongly what the previous speaker mentioned, and that is to get busy on research wherever and whenever we can, as quickly as we can. We know that people in countries where research is being carried on have a lot of information. We can by sending men trained and thinking about virus to those countries, and those laboratories learn a lot before it is necessary for us to have our own facilities working anywhere. We need virus men who are both within and without Government service at the present time; and, to use also the former speaker's analogy of an atomic bomb, when we did that we reached out and got the best nuclear scientists we could on that program wherever they were available in the United States; and we must do the same thing with virus specialists if we are to get anywhere with this research. We are doing research on human and plant diseases all over the world. We can do it some place else.

We speak about the loss of a laboratory maybe through war. Yes; and you can lose your laboratory in the interests, too, through the medium of an outbreak of foot-and-mouth disease. There has been some discussion of placing a laboratory on Angel Island in San Francisco Bay. Let us assume for the sake of discussion that you put a laboratory there at a cost of \$15,000,000, or whatever it might cost. After you have been in operation 6 months, we will assume you have an active virus in there, and we have a present repetition of what happened in California in 1924. Let us say that the virus actually came in through ship garbage. I do not think agriculture in California would ever look further than that laboratory. I think there would be so much difficulty raised that the laboratory would be compelled to fold up and you would have lost your investment anyway. I think that is true of any State where the laboratory might be placed. Agriculture has been thoroughly schooled by our Government that this virus is too dangerous to play with when we do not have infection in the country. If we do get infection, that is a different story. We will work in it or under it the same as we did then with brucellosis. There is another point that I think is of extreme importance to bring up at this point also. The previous speaker mentioned the use of vaccine and asked questions of our livestock-disease-control officials here. I think it is all important that this Government make up its mind what we are going to do if we have foot-and-mouth disease in here next week, as to whether or not we are going to permit the use of vaccine or whether we are going to go straight down the road on slaughter.

It would be disastrous for this country to do the same thing that was done in Mexico. I happened to be in the State of Queretaro when the El Jacal herd broke out in foot-and-mouth disease. That was an excellent herd of purebred animals. They were slaughtered.

The blood lines, as mentioned by the Congressman from Texas, were lost; and now we change the program and all around this premise where these fine-blooded animals were destroyed are ordinary cattle that we anticipate protection for through the use of vaccine. If that happens to pure-blooded animals in this country, it is going to be a very regrettable thing.

I know the question is hard to decide, but foot-and-mouth disease never makes anything but a mess of so-and-so's out of anybody who works with it. You are going to have to make a decision and I think you are going to have to make it very quickly so we can know what we are going to do.

Mr. Chairman, I am inclined to believe that agriculture has listened to our Bureau of Animal Industry for so many years and so recently saying that it was dangerous to handle the virus in this country that we are in the position of the man who asked for a loan of \$5, and when the banker said, "What did you say?" He said, "Will you loan me \$10?" And the banker said, "I heard you the first time." I think we heard them the first time. We heard them in July, August, and November.

They said it was too dangerous. Now, in January when we said it was all right, we say, we heard you the first time. I think that is about as much as I have to offer, Mr. Chairman, and I will be glad, if I can, to try to answer any questions the committee might have.

Mr. GILLIE. Now, you know something about this disease. You have studied it and been with it. What recommendations could you give to this committee on the research problem we have before us today?

Dr. DUCKWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I would propose that our Government comb these United States for men with a leaning toward virus diseases. You know, Mr. Chairman—the other men, probably because they do not have that particular line of training, do not appreciate it as well as you do—that a man might be a wonder on streptococcus and have studied that whole family, but he would not know too much about virus, and the other way around. I think we should comb these United States and get the finest men we can on virus diseases. We should look for some young men that have a good span of life ahead of them that can learn and give something to you. I would send those men to work cooperatively with any of the foreign countries that would permit us to work comparatively with them. If I am correctly informed, there is a lot of Europe that does not have any money in its pocket. I cannot help but feel that those people would be tickled to death if a little American money were put into their countries to augment the work that they are doing on the study of foot-and-mouth disease and its viruses.

I think we could progress a long way before we did find it necessary to have our own physical facilities to do the job. In Mexico I think we can do some research.

Yes; there are problems in there that are difficult. I appreciate that. There are problems as to the acquisition of animals that you know are absolutely clean; but the same thing that brings it to us, transportation, could remove that. It is expensive, but it could be done. I think we should cooperate with the Mexican Government in some work to be done down there with some physical facilities to be instituted in Mexico and we should have men throughout the world,

wherever a government will welcome us, to study with the scientists that are already working.

Mr. GILLIE. It is your opinion, then, that we should find these scientists and send them to the old country to take up this work and try to perfect it before we build a research laboratory of our own?

Dr. DUCKWORTH. I think I would put in the temporary facilities that would do a pretty good job in Mexico. I think there are a lot of things we can learn without having the absolute top-notch sort of facilities and things we are talking about in this country.

Mr. GILLIE. Do you think our Bureau would be willing to go down there with the Mexican Government, and do research work?

Dr. DUCKWORTH. I do not know whether they would or not. I appreciate the Mexican people, the situation in Mexico. I think I know Mexicans about as well as most folks. I was raised with them and I am one-quarter Mexican myself. I believe that with the proper handling of those people, they will cooperate with us. We are in the dog house now; I will concede that.

Mr. WORLEY. Somehow or other we have not been able to find that way to cooperate.

Dr. DUCKWORTH. The reason for that, I believe, Congressman Worley, is because the Mexicans were convinced from the start that this job could not be done the way we wanted to do it. I think if you give them a ray of hope, they will go with you. Mexico has some pretty capable veterinary scientists, too. I think they would welcome an opportunity to cooperate with this country on a job that they thought offered them a little ray of hope.

Mr. BRAMBLETT. Do you feel, Dr. Duckworth, that from the very beginning we did not have a chance in Mexico?

Dr. DUCKWORTH. Yes, sir.

Mr. BRAMBLETT. Do you agree with all of the statements that have been made by Senator Hatfield, as well as Senator Powers?

Dr. DUCKWORTH. Yes, sir; I concur 100 percent.

Mr. GILLIE. That concludes our hearing this morning.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Mr. Chairman, may I have 1 minute? I would like to call attention to this point that was mentioned this morning, and I think that a conclusion ought to be drawn from it, that after the Brazilian bulls were landed in Mexico on the 28th of September 1946, and then our scientists, Dr. Wardlow and Dr. Snyder, made an inspection of those bulls and all of the cattle that were supposed to have come in contact with both shipments of bulls. They issued a statement that they had inspected those cattle and found them clean of disease. Then the President on the night of the 17th of October in his speech stated that he was lifting the embargo on Mexican cattle and allowing them to come in.

Now, then, the two men we had down there, Dr. Wardlow and Dr. Snyder, were not only good scientists but were experienced field men in field work. If they couldn't find the disease either among the cattle that were supposed to be exposed to these bulls or among the bulls themselves, do you not think the industry is justified in its fear of the conclusions that the scientists might make and that we are a little afraid of their statement now that it would not be dangerous to have the virus brought into this country? It was immediately after that that we know that the disease broke out in Mexico about the 1st

of November. It was not reported up here until the 19th of December, but it existed there just a few days after this inspection was made, so scientists cannot tell about that.

We are, I think, justified in our position that we are fearful of that situation. We are fearful of the conclusion that scientists might make about the safety of bringing the virus in and bringing in the infected animals. That is all I wanted to say about that point.

Another point is, at the beginning last August I sent to the Department of Agriculture clippings from a number of Mexican newspapers that I take. They are in Spanish, and I am sure the Department had the translations made. Among those clippings were several statements issued by the former President of Mexico there to the effect that he had vaccinated his cattle. He made a full statement. This was in a statement signed by General Cardenas himself, the former President, and that he had vaccinated his herds and that in doing so he had immunized his cattle against the disease and himself against the bite, so he said he had vaccinated several thousand head of cattle.

Now, I have inquired from the Mexican scientist, down there, Dr. Camargo, whether or not any vaccinating had ever been done. I made this inquiry after I had read General Cardenas' signed statement. He said it was not so. I wonder if the Department has any information about the use of vaccine in Mexico during this period of time. I think it might be helpful to the committee if they had that information and that the effect of it was if they did use it.

Dr. DUCKWORTH. Mr. Chairman, may I have one more word, please? I am glad that Judge Montague thought of that. It brought to mind a point that I thought of while I was listening and I forgot to touch on it. We have heard about the importation of animals into this country, stopping off to acquire citizenship in another country and then coming on into this country. There is some record, I think, in the files of the Bureau about some hogs that came from Denmark by way of the Virgin Islands. There seems to be some provision in some law that permits such a thing as that under the regulation of the section and the 60-day period admits them. Then if they are going to accept the theory that the bulls brought the disease from Brazil, than that regulation needs very serious overhauling. Those bulls came on to that island, if I am correctly informed, the 12th of May. You have May, June, July, August, September, and October, and November, 6 or 7 months in which there was apparently no evidence of foot-and-mouth disease. Let us say it was November when the Mexicans suspected it and we got down there in December. You have a minimum of 6 months, anyway, in which those bulls reportedly and reputedly manifested no foot-and-mouth disease.

Now, had they moved to some place else and come in under the 60-day citizenship, then we might have had foot-and-mouth disease here. If we accept that theory, that they brought it in, I think we are very unsafe in permitting animals to come in after they acquire citizenship on a short stay in another country.

Senator HATFIELD. Mr. Chairman, at that point, I would like to add that I had a search made and I searched myself a limited time. I could find no regulation such as Dr. Duckworth has referred to except amendment No. 3 that I referred to yesterday that was in existence from the 5th of June until the 18th of October. I wonder if you would

ask the members of the Bureau of Animal Industry whether there is any such regulation as Dr. Duckworth refers to under some 1890 law? I was unable to find any. I wondered if they could answer that question.

Mr. WORLEY. I think the committee ought to be a little bit clearer on just what all the regulations are.

Dr. SIMMS. Dr. Fladness can give you a statement on that.

Dr. FLADNESS. The basis statute prohibits the importation of animals that are diseased or that have been exposed to disease within 60 days. In other words, we must satisfy ourselves in permitting importation of animals that they have not been exposed to these diseases within 60 days.

Mr. BRAMBLETT. By basic statute you mean 1890?

Dr. FLADNESS. That is the 1890 statute. Beyond that 60 days, it is within the discretion of the Secretary of Agriculture by regulation to stipulate conditions under which they can come in. Now, that is the basis for the 60-day proposition. It has been the practice in connection with some other countries that when they have been in a country that we have every reason to believe, to the best of our knowledge, that they are free from these diseases—when they have been in that country 50 or 60 days, they are considered to have complied with that statute and they are then imported as cattle or hogs or sheep of the country from which they come to the United States.

Mr. WORLEY. Is there any question in your mind but what the disease was brought in by these bulls from Brazil to Mexico?

Dr. FLADNESS. I must say that we of our own knowledge do not know that the bulls brought the disease. We have, if I may be permitted to say so, stated always that we do not know. Now, when the Mexicans first got the report of the disease down there and went to investigate, which began on the 5th of December, as I recall it, they looked into the history of when the disease first appeared and so on and it was established, according to their evidence, not ours, that it had first appeared in the last few days of October or around the 1st of November.

It was their conclusion, as stated to us, that it first appeared on the ranch or in the immediate neighborhood of the ranch where those bulls were placed in Mexico. That is not our investigation, that is theirs.

Mr. WORLEY. Our Government made no independent investigation?

Dr. FLADNESS. No, sir; we did not attempt to dig into the history of the origin of it in Mexico.

Mr. WORLEY. As one who is probably most familiar with the circumstances, do you think it would be safe to assume these Zebu bulls brought in the disease?

Dr. FLADNESS. I would not go so far as to say that we would be safe in assuming it, because it comes out now by statements of a former Mexican official himself that there have been other clandestine movements of livestock into Mexico of which we had no knowledge at all.

For instance, fighting bulls come in perhaps by two's or three's. It is not difficult. We had been warning them all the years that you can do it once or twice, or maybe even 10 times, but you eventually will bring in the wrong one. Which of these was the wrong one I

am not prepared to say, and I do not think I would be safe in assuming that it was any particular one of them.

Senator HATFIELD. Mr. Chairman, might I ask through you another question, and that is this—whether or not the Bureau has ever had any legal opinion as to whether or not the 60-day provision of the law of 1890 was affected by section 306 and 306 (a) of the Tariff Act of 1930 which prohibited the importation of animals from any country in which the Secretary of Agriculture found foot-and-mouth disease to exist.

In other words, I want to know whether or not that section passed in 1930 would not have the effect of overruling or repealing or nullifying that portion of the law of 1890 which referred to the 60-day period?

Mr. GILLIE. I will have to ask the Bureau of Animal Industry to answer that.

Senator HATFIELD. I am wondering if they ever had any legal opinion on that point.

Dr. FLADNESS. We do not have a direct legal opinion on that, but informally we have had that opinion. We have had no formal written opinion on that specific point. It has been held in a number of other cases in connection with section 306 (a) that the importation is from the country from which they are shipped to the United States. That is what is prohibited by section 306 (a).

For instance, the Canadian situation. By agreement at an Empire Conference in 1930, the Canadians agreed to accept breeding cattle from Great Britain, notwithstanding that they were not 100 percent clean but under control, provided certain special restrictions were placed on them, like quarantine. They are the ones who issue the permits. If our people want to get animals of British origin, we do not have a thing in the world to do with it. They get their permits from the Canadian authorities. They import them into Canada, and under the combination of the two laws when they later wish to import them into the United States with proof that those animals have been there in Canada and have been accepted by the Canadians so that it fully meets the 60-day freedom-from-exposure clause, they are eligible for importation into the United States.

Mr. GILLIE. Mr. Bramblett has a question.

Mr. BRAMBLETT. It is a little bit unrelated to the specific subject, Dr. Fladness, but I wonder if you and Dr. Sinms will take it up with the proper authorities and see if we cannot get that secret report of yours from the lower part of South America put into this record so we can get all of the information. Somebody is always talking about a secret report. I would like to get as many of them as we can into the open. Maybe we can then start and go. Will you see if we can get that and put it in the record with the permission of the chairman?

Dr. FLADNESS. I am in the same position as Dr. Wardlow and Dr. Snyder in Mexico. We go out and we do our best to get absolutely all the information we can, and we report our findings, and that is as far as we can go. As far as I am concerned, this report is no secret, you understand.

Mr. BRAMBLETT. I would like to have you transmit the request.

Dr. FLADNESS. I have never interposed any objection to the inclusion in the record of the report, as far as I am concerned.

Mr. WORLEY. Touching on the question Mr. Montague brought up, just how effective has the use of vaccine been in Mexico?

Dr. FLADNESS. Our people were not a party to that vaccination at all. It was done before we operated down there. There have been some reports that have come to our people, but it was not reliable enough to give you any good report on it. It is just more or less hearsay and we did not know just what animals had been vaccinated or under what conditions it was done, or anything about it. As to the effectiveness, I do not know that they have any reliable information on that. I could not testify as to that.

Mr. WORLEY. Have we not been using vaccine recently in the joint program?

Dr. FLADNESS. Well, they are preparing to.

Mr. WORLEY. They have not yet used any at all?

Dr. FLADNESS. Whether they started, I am not sure.

Dr. SIMMS. I would like to say the first shipment of vaccine to arrive in Mexico had been improperly shipped. We thought it inadvisable to use it. The second shipment arrived, I think, on Monday of this week, and the third shipment was expected yesterday. Up to the present time they have not been using vaccine in Mexico.

Mr. WORLEY. But you will include that information in your report?

Dr. SIMMS. Yes.

(The information referred to is as follows:)

Vaccine arrived in Mexico from both Holland and the Argentine the week of February 2, 1948. These are being tested.

Mr. GILLIE. All right, gentlemen. If there is nothing else to come before this committee, we will stand adjourned until further call.

(Whereupon, at 12:15 p. m., the committee adjourned until further call.)

DIGEST OF
CONGRESSIONAL PROCEEDINGS
OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND FINANCE
Division of Legislative Reports
(For Department staff only)

Issued February 6, 1948
For actions of February 5, 1958
80th-2nd, No. 23

CONTENTS

Adjournment.....	6,11	Inflation.....	21	Quarantine, animal.....	23
Budgeting.....	10	Information.....	25	Rationing.....	16
Crop insurance.....	18	Lands.....	12	Research.....	3,11
Dairy industry.....	8	Lands, reclamation....	17,18	Animal industry.....	1
Farm program.....	2,18	Livestock and meat....	1,8,23	Roads.....	13
Federal aid.....	13,18	Loans, farm.....	7	Small business.....	24
Foreign affairs.....	18	Oleomargarine.....	18,14	Soil conservation....	18,19
Relief.....	4,9,20	Prices, control.....	16	Taxation.....	8,14
Furs.....	7	Prices, farm.....	8	Transportation.....	5
Housing.....	18,22	Prices, support.....	8	Wildlife.....	15

HIGHLIGHTS: Senate committee approved for reporting (1) long-range farm program report and (2) foot-and-mouth disease research bill. Senate passed bill to continue and enlarge program for research on liquid fuels from agricultural, forestry, and other products. House Rules Committee cleared RACC fur-loans bill. Rep. Murray (Wis.) claimed administration is not supporting dairy prices. Reps. Poage and Rivers urged oleo-tax repeal. Rep. Hill claimed milk prices are too low in view of feed costs.

SENATE

1. FOOT-AND-MOUTH DISEASE. The Agriculture and Forestry Committee approved for reporting S. 2038, to provide for research on this disease, with amendment (p. D99).
2. LONG-RANGE FARM PROGRAM. The Agriculture and Forestry Committee approved the report of the Aiken subcommittee, provided for its release Feb. 8, and is to make the report to the Senate on Feb. 9 (p. D99).
3. FUEL RESEARCH. Passed without amendment S. 134, to authorize \$30,000,000 additional for construction and operation of demonstration plants to produce synthetic liquid fuels from coal, oil shales, agricultural and forestry products, etc. (pp. 1161-75).
4. FOREIGN AID. The Foreign Relations Committee concluded hearings on the proposed European Recovery Program and is to meet in executive session on Feb. 9 to begin the drafting of a bill (p. D100).
5. ST. LAWRENCE WATERWAY. Continued debate on S. J. Res. 111, providing for this project (pp. 1143-57).
6. RECESSED until Mon., Feb. 9 (p. 1165).

HOUSE

7. FURS; FARM LOANS. The Rules Committee reported a resolution for the consideration of H.J.Res. 275, to authorize RACC loans to fur farmers (pp. 1187, 1197).

8. DAIRY INDUSTRY; OLEOMARGARINE. Rep. Murray, Wis., said, "If the administration will not even announce the support price for milk and will not support the price of dairy byproducts, they must assume the responsibility for prices, whether high or low," and spoke in opposition to the repeal of oleomargarine taxes (p. 1189).

Reps. Poage (Tex.) and Rivers (S.C.) urged repeal of the taxes on oleomargarine (pp. 1188-9).

Rep. Hill, Colo., claimed the farmers "cannot afford to buy this high priced dairy feed and sell their milk at present prices" (p. 1189).

Rep. Sabath, Ill., urged repeal of oleomargarine taxes and an investigation of the "outrageous prices" of meat and dairy products (p. 1196).

9. FOREIGN AID. Rep. Keating, N.Y., urged that provision be made in the proposed ERP that countries who are to receive aid use the assets held by their own nationals in the U. S. and other countries (p. 1191).

Rep. Blatnik, Minn., urged that free postage be provided for relief packages to Europe (p. 1191).

Received a Mass. Legislature memorial urging a sound ERP (p. 1198).

10. LEGISLATIVE BUDGET. The "Daily Digest" states that the Joint Legislative Budget subcommittee approved a report which is to be submitted to the full Committee today, Feb. 6, with the following tentative figures for the fiscal year 1949: Estimated expenditures, \$37.2 billion (\$2.5 billion less than President's Budget); estimated revenue, \$47.3 billion; and minimum to be applied to the debt, \$2.6 billion (p. D102).

11. ADJOURNED until Mon., Feb. 9 (p. 1197). Rep. Arends, Ill., stated that H.R. 2161, to authorize an additional \$30,000,000 for research on synthetic liquid fuels from agricultural, forestry, and other products is to be considered Mon. (p. 1197).

BILLS INTRODUCED

12. LANDS. S. 2132, by Sen. Butler, Nebr., to authorize the participation of States in revenues from national parks, national monuments, and other areas subject to the primary administrative jurisdiction of the National Park Service; and to establish a National Park Land Commission and provide for the acquisition of lands within areas subject to the primary administrative jurisdiction of the National Park Service. To Interior and Insular Affairs Committee. (p. 1140).

13. FEDERAL AID HIGHWAYS. S. 2134, by Sen. Cordon, Ore., to amend and supplement the Federal Aid Road Act to authorize appropriations for continuing the postwar construction of highways. To Public Works Committee. (p. 1140.)

14. OLEOMARGARINE TAX. H.R. 5292, by Rep. Corbett, Pa., to reduce the taxes on yellow oleomargarine made from domestic fats and oils and on dealers in such oleomargarine. To Agriculture Committee. (p. 1198.)

15. WILDLIFE. H.R. 5300, by Rep. Murray, Wis., to provide for the conservation and preservation of fish, wildlife, and game on the Menominee Reservation, Wis., including the enforcement and prosecution of violators. To Public Lands Committee. (p. 1198.)

ITEMS IN APPENDIX.

16. RATIONING; PRICE CONTROL. Extension of remarks of Rep. Cole, N.Y., stating that current price rises are caused by foreign shipments and inserting an Ithaca (N.Y.) Cooperative Grange League Federation Exchange letter opposing rationing and price control (pp. A705-6).

RESEARCH ON FOOT-AND-MOUTH DISEASE

S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE
LAW LIBRARY
LEGISLATIVE REPORTING



HEARING

BEFORE THE

COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY

UNITED STATES SENATE

EIGHTIETH CONGRESS

SECOND SESSION

ON

S. 2038

A BILL TO ENABLE THE SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE TO CONDUCT RESEARCH ON FOOT-AND-MOUTH DISEASE AND OTHER DISEASES OF ANIMALS AND TO AMEND THE ACT OF MAY 29, 1884 (23 STAT. 31), AS AMENDED, BY
ADDING ANOTHER SECTION

FEBRUARY 5, 1948

Printed for the use of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry



• UNITED STATES
GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE
WASHINGTON : 1948



COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY

ARTHUR CAPPER, Kansas, *Chairman*

GEORGE D. AIKEN, Vermont

HARLAN J. BUSHFIELD, South Dakota

GEORGE A. WILSON, Iowa

MILTON R. YOUNG, North Dakota

EDWARD J. THYE, Minnesota

JAMES P. KEM, Missouri

ELMER THOMAS, Oklahoma

ALLEN J. ELLENDER, Louisiana

SCOTT W. LUCAS, Illinois

TOM STEWART, Tennessee

CLYDE R. HOEY, North Carolina

CLAUDE PEPPER, Florida

JAMES M. KENDALL, *Clerk*

RESEARCH ON FOOT-AND-MOUTH DISEASE

THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 5, 1948

UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY,
Washington, D. C.

The committee met, pursuant to notice, at 11 a. m., in room 324, Senate Office Building, Senator Arthur Capper presiding.

Present: Senators Capper (chairman), Aiken, Bushfield, Young, Thy, Ellender, and Hoey.

The CHAIRMAN. The committee will please come to order.

This hearing is to consider Senate bill 2038, introduced by Senator Thy, which will be made a part of this record at this point.

(The bill under consideration, S. 2038, is as follows:)

[S. 2038, 80th Cong., 2d sess.]

A BILL To enable the Secretary of Agriculture to conduct research on foot-and-mouth disease and other diseases of animals and to amend the Act of May 29, 1884 (23 Stat. 31), as amended, by adding another section

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Act of May 29, 1884 (23 Stat. 31), as amended, is hereby amended by adding thereto section 12.

"SEC. 12. The Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to establish research laboratories, including the acquisition of necessary land, buildings, or facilities, and also the making of research contracts under the authority contained in section 10 (a) of the Bankhead-Jones Act of 1935 as amended by the Research and Marketing Act of 1946, for research and study, in the United States or elsewhere, of foot-and-mouth disease and other animal diseases which, in the opinion of the Secretary, constitute a threat to the livestock industry of the United States. To carry out the provisions of this section, the Secretary is authorized to employ technical experts or scientists without regard to the Classification Act: *Provided*, That the number so employed shall not exceed five and that the maximum compensation for each shall not exceed \$15,000 per annum. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as Congress may deem necessary; in addition, the Secretary is authorized to utilize, in carrying out this section, funds otherwise available for the control or eradication of such diseases."

The CHAIRMAN. Our witness this morning is Dr. B. T. Simms, Chief, Bureau of Animal Industry, United States Department of Agriculture.

STATEMENT OF DR. B. T. SIMMS, CHIEF, BUREAU OF ANIMAL INDUSTRY, UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE, WASHINGTON, D. C.

The CHAIRMAN. Dr. Simms, how long have you been in the Department of Agriculture?

Dr. SIMMS. I have been with the Department of Agriculture as a full-time man for 10 years and for 10 years before that I was working as an agent. I have worked with the Department of Agriculture for 20 years.

The CHAIRMAN. How long have you been Chief of the Bureau of Animal Industry?

Dr. SIMMS. I have been Chief of the Bureau of Animal Industry for just a little over 2 years.

The CHAIRMAN. Have you made a study of this bill, S. 2038?

Dr. SIMMS. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. We should like to have your views on this bill, Dr. Simms.

Dr. SIMMS. I have submitted a statement here as to the program which we have in mind concerning research on foot-and-mouth disease. I should like to supplement that statement with this other statement.

The CHAIRMAN. Both statements will be made a part of the record. (The two statements referred to are as follows:)

STATEMENT CONCERNING RESEARCH ON FOOT-AND-MOUTH DISEASE SUBMITTED JANUARY 26, 1948, TO SUBCOMMITTEE ON FOOT-AND-MOUTH DISEASE BY B. T. SIMMS

Research with this disease should consist of two types of work: i. e., that which can be done immediately and a long-range program.

I. RESEARCH WHICH IS BEING UNDERTAKEN IMMEDIATELY

The immediate program is already set up under authority already granted. It consists of work in both Europe and Mexico. Qualified research men will be sent to laboratories engaged in foot-and-mouth disease research in England, Holland, Denmark, Switzerland, and possibly other countries. These men will engage in cooperative work with the investigators in the various institutions, and will also become familiar with the problems concerned with foot-and-mouth disease research and methods of procedure in the various institutions. In this investigational work, experimental animals, including cattle, swine, and guinea pigs will be used, and the appropriate share of such expenses incurred, including special equipment used in this investigational work, will be paid by the United States Department of Agriculture.

The work will cover:

1. Determination of the types of the viruses existing in Mexico through animal experimentation and serological means;
2. Methods of preparing vaccines from Mexican and European strains and the testing of such vaccines;
3. Studies on diagnostic procedures; and
4. Chemical, physical, serological, and immunological investigation on viruses.

The Mexican phase of the immediate research program will include:

1. Tests in Mexican cattle of presently available European vaccines against Mexican virus, and the purchase and administration of small lots of presently available European vaccines for use on a field experimental basis in Mexico; and
2. The preparation of vaccines in Europe from Mexican strains of virus and the experimental testing of such vaccines on Mexican cattle in Mexico.

II. LONG-RANGE RESEARCH PROGRAM ON FOOT-AND-MOUTH DISEASE

The events of the past year, with respect to the spread of foot-and-mouth disease in Mexico make it highly desirable and necessary that the Department establish a long-range research program covering all phases of the disease. No work has been initiated in this country in the past because the disease was not present, and because of the fear of possible spread of the disease if research work were carried on within the confines of the United States. However, the disease is now prevalent in an adjoining country, and therefore is a direct threat to our livestock industry. Furthermore, air travel has made it possible for people to come to this country from any continent within a very short while. We have thus lost the protection of distance. Therefore, we should begin without delay a well-rounded research program that will supply us with the necessary information for protecting our livestock interests.

The establishment of research activities with foot-and-mouth disease within the borders of this country may give rise to misgivings because of the fear of possible spread of the disease from the base of such activities. The experience of British and other laboratories has demonstrated, however, that such research, if properly safeguarded, can be conducted without fear of spread. We believe, furthermore, that it is not practical to establish the base of research activities in a foreign country or on some isolated island off the coast. A location on United States territory will insure complete control of the program by the Department.

Since foot-and-mouth disease is the most easily transmitted of all the infections which attack livestock the utmost precautions must be taken in any laboratory in which work with it is done. Specially designed buildings or quarters are necessary. We have set up certain criteria which we believe should be met in the location of facilities which will be used for research operations on foot-and-mouth disease. It is desirable that the laboratory be isolated as far as possible from contact with domestic and wild animals that may be susceptible to foot-and-mouth disease. It should be removed from as much human traffic as possible. It would also be desirable to locate this laboratory in close proximity to other medical research centers. We have done considerable exploring for suitable locations. Isolated islands, while having certain advantages, have the disadvantage in that a great amount of handling is required of any material needed in research and also presents a very serious problem from the standpoint of personnel. It would be difficult to recruit and retain a sufficient number of trustworthy workers in extreme isolation for any extended period of time. The importance of the project and the part that the personnel will play, not only in carrying out experimental work but also in taking the necessary steps to prevent the escape of the virus from its confines, is such that the personnel should be very carefully selected. Special provisions should be made so that the proper type of worker is employed and that those endangering the safety of the project be summarily removed. Satisfactory arrangements to this end should be made with the Civil Service Commission at an early date.

The program undertaken at such a laboratory should include the following:

1. Fundamental research on the virus itself including its physical, chemical, and biological properties and its relations to other viruses.
2. Studies of modes of transmission including carrier animals, wildlife, etc.
3. Attempts at development of better diagnostic methods.
4. Studies of the different strains of the virus and their relations to one another.
5. Attempts to develop more effective and less expensive vaccines.
6. Efforts to develop more efficient methods of disinfecting contaminated premises and areas.

STATEMENT BY DR. I. A. GALLOWAY, DIRECTOR AND SCIENTIFIC SECRETARY, RESEARCH INSTITUTE, BRITISH FOOT-AND-MOUTH DISEASE RESEARCH COMMITTEE

The control of foot-and mouth disease is an international responsibility and it is highly desirable that there should be free interchange of ideas and views. The task is heavy and the laboratories are few but all should be willing to give of their best. You may ask, and with reason, what special attributes I possess to justify my expressing an opinion on problems connected with foot-and-mouth disease or diseases associated with causative agents or viruses with similar general characteristics to the virus of that disease. I can say only that I have been associated with, and extremely interested in, research into such virus diseases in general and foot-and-mouth disease in particular for some 25 years and for the last 8 or 9 years I have been held entirely responsible for everything that goes wrong in the Research Institute of the British Foot-and-Mouth Disease Research Committee.

You may consider that this is not a very good background and that such a person might have "gone stale" and that it might be better to seek the opinions of someone who could view the problem in better perspective, one who had not had "his nose so close to the grindstone." That, however, is for you to judge. The extenuating circumstances are that I have, on occasion, had an opportunity to have a glimpse at the outside world and to appreciate the activities of other laboratory workers in the same field. At intervals over a period of years dating from 1925, I have paid visits to research centers engaged on the foot-and-mouth disease problem, research centers installed on the mainland, "set-ups" in the precincts of a town, or again built on islands, islands which started as such

but which, owing to ultimate appreciation of the difficulties attendant on the carrying out of prolonged research of this type may have become transformed into peninsulas with artificially produced isthmuses by virtue of the construction of suspension bridges, islands which at certain seasons of the year become connected with the mainland by a sheet of ice rather than remaining separated from it by a sheet of water, and finally a research center on a small peninsula. I have thus been in a fairly good position to appreciate not only the trials and torments of those engaged on this problem but also the points which must be considered in setting up a new research center to study the disease.

Now, with regard to this great scourge, the United States of America is in a similar position to that in which Great Britain found herself some 30 to 40 years ago. As the result of what has transpired during the last 18 months, the threat of the possible introduction of foot-and-mouth disease into the United States, which is always present, has become more imminent. This change of situation, fraught with great danger, has been created by the occurrence of the disease in Mexico with the nearer approach of the infection to United States territory. Now three or four decades ago Great Britain had to consider exactly the same type of problem that your officials are obliged to consider now. Officials in Great Britain, after deliberations initiated by public criticism, decided to explore the possibility of carrying out research on the disease with a view to devising means, whether by protective inoculation with vaccines or other procedures whereby it might be rendered less harmful to the livestock industry. Owing to a certain amount of opposition, especially from stock owners, to any proposal for the setting up of a research center on the mainland of Great Britain, first consideration was given to the possibility of carrying out experiments on the disease in India. Some officials were sent out to explore the possibility but they soon came to the conclusion that, owing to the apparent variable susceptibility of cattle in India, arising either from the resistance of different breeds or due to the fact that the disease was endemic in the country and that the animals tested had acquired resistance by having passed through the disease before, there was no assurance that early and rapid progress could be made there in a direction which would be of immediate service to stock owners in Great Britain itself. Later on, with the same restrictive concepts in view, an attempt was made to pursue experiments on the disease on a boat moved off the coast of England. This shows to what extent scientists against their better judgment are obliged to yield to uninformed opinion. This fantastic project was soon abandoned as being quite impracticable and the floating swan assumed the attributes of a white elephant.

It was not so justifiable to pass over lightly the suggestion which has come up again and again of installing a research station on a small island rather than on the mainland. One can fully appreciate the qualms of some, especially stock owners, who may visualize the research center becoming a greater menace than the potential risks of introduction of the disease from over the border, in other words the fear that the attempted cure might be worse than the disease. Suffice to say at this point that, although it is easy to understand that the uninitiated could indulge in the entertainment of such fears, provided all the necessary special precautionary measures are taken as regards provision of structural protective systems, control of specially trained personnel with bathing and changing regulations and the wearing of protective clothing, air-conditioning, disinfection, and the suitable safe disposal of infective effluent and animal excreta, research on this highly infectious and contagious disease can be carried out with a great margin of security on the mainland.

It must be appreciated that although the measure of security against spread of the disease given by the installation of a research institute on an island may appear appreciably greater at least on paper than if the institute is on the mainland it may in actual fact not be so and any apparent advantages are heavily outweighed by the many disadvantages and high impracticability for a long-time policy of research. It would take too long to elaborate on this question here.

The question of research on foot-and-mouth disease on a small island received early consideration in England but finally in 1924 a committee was appointed and it was decided that a research center for the purpose should be set up on the mainland. The Pirbright Research Institute of the British Foot-and-Mouth Disease Research Committee is situated in a country district in the county of Surrey about 30 miles from London. There is a restriction order in force to prohibit the grazing of susceptible farm animals in close proximity to the institute. There are about half a dozen small dairy herds within between one-half and 2-mile range so that the immediate vicinity is but sparsely populated

with cattle and other susceptible farm stock. There are a number of larger dairy herds within 5 or 6 miles. In spite of this fact, owing to the stringent rules in force, there has never been any evidence that any outbreaks of foot-and-mouth disease in the area have been due to escape of infection from the institute.

Foot-and-mouth disease cannot be considered as being endemic in Great Britain. It is introduced from outside at irregular intervals and cases occur sporadically; this fact and the geographical position provide conditions which are conducive to the adoption of a stamping-out policy (that is, the rapid elimination of affected animals, disinfection, and application of a stand-still order). Nevertheless it has always been realized that in those untoward circumstances which might arise in which this policy broke down, it might be necessary to consider other methods of control such as vaccination either alone or judiciously combined with slaughter. Such are in application in other countries which are less favorably placed.

For this and another reason it was considered essential that research on foot-and-mouth disease should be pursued in Great Britain. The other reason was that it was felt that any results of experiments and tests would be useful to other countries in which the disease is endemic and when those countries used them in methods of controlling and preventing the disease in livestock this would have the general effect of diminishing the amount of infection about and thus the risk of introducing the disease into Great Britain. Under the exigencies of war or in circumstances in which it was not possible for any reason to keep pace with the rapid spread of infection, a stamping-out policy which involved slaughter of farm stock and disinfection alone, to the exclusion of other preventive measures, such as vaccination by itself or combined with slaughter of susceptible farm stock, would have to be abandoned.

Now the United States of America at the present juncture cannot afford to view the position with complacency and adopt the slogan "it can't happen here." The urgency of the situation must not be forgotten for the enemy is at the gates; "yet a little sleep, a little slumber, a little folding of the hands to sleep so shall thy poverty come as one that travelleth and thy want as an armed man." Let us now assume that full agreement has been reached or, since this is a goal not easy to attain, that at least the weight of opinion is in favor of the urgent necessity of setting up an institute of sufficient capacity for long-term investigations on foot-and-mouth disease, or if occasion arose, other diseases of a similar nature which might threaten the livestock industry of the United States; and on territory of sufficient acreage to allow of some extension should accommodation of one sort or another be ultimately required.

Then it is apparent to all that the next step requires a considerable amount of careful reflection and that step is the selection of a suitable site. Let us suggest that within the limitations of human wisdom we come "as a prophet new inspired" to visualize its location. Such a site should not be only imaginary when considered in relation to the geographical attributes of the United States and there are no doubt wise counsellors attendant upon us with charts, maps, compasses, and the like. The spot which would provide ideal conditions is on a seaboard and preferably on a small peninsula rather than on an island. So that the matter may be clear in our minds, the definitions of a peninsula given in the Webster's Collegiate Dictionary are as follows: A portion of land nearly surrounded by water and joined to a larger body (the body in this case is the United States) by a neck or isthmus or alternately any piece of land jutting out into the sea. Our site should preferably be on a portion of land which would conform rather to the first definition as regards position than to the second and in any case the narrower the isthmus the better. The portion of land itself should be an area in which the population with cattle and other susceptible farm stock is of a low order. The site selected should be within reasonable distance of a large town in which there is a university and other research institutes, schools, and colleges so that the members of the scientific staff engaged on the research can commune with their fellow workers in similar and other fields of study. The proximity to the sea or at least to an efficient sewer system would facilitate the safe disposal of disease-infected effluent and manure after suitable preliminary disinfectant treatment. The fact that the sea would be a means of approach to this favored location would be an advantage in those dire, but one hopes rare, circumstances which might arise and make it well-nigh impossible or at least inadvisable to use transport by land for bringing susceptible experimental animals to the research, or what might under the stress of disease spread have become a vaccine-producing center. In the offing there should be schooling facilities, medical and dental treatment, social amenities, and diversions. So much for the site.

Now it is perhaps not fully appreciated how costly research on foot-and-mouth disease is and it would perhaps be as well if some stress was placed on this. The eight samples of virus had been collected in Mexico from different centers of infection and these were transported to the Research Institute of the British Foot-and-Mouth Disease Research Committee at Pirbright. It was necessary to examine these in great detail in order to determine whether there was only one type of infective agent involved, to investigate the characteristics of the virus and to carry out at the same time vaccination experiments. In this work 527 cattle have been used to date at an average price of \$104 per head plus 477 guinea pigs at a cost of about \$800, making a total cost of \$55,000. Now this money was expended in investigating just one problem. It is necessary to carry out the studies on cattle, and working with these is costly, not only in respect of the animals themselves but in providing suitable accommodations for them. Elaborate experimental units have to be specially constructed to house the experimental animals so as to obviate the possibility not only of virus escaping from the institute and being carried to livestock outside, but in order to avoid accidental infections within the confines of the institute which would vitiate the results of experiments. These are exceedingly costly, as air-conditioning should be provided to include air sterilization; all the feeding arrangements have to be specially constructed, separate passageways, impervious walls, and flooring must be provided; bathing and changing units for personnel must be erected. As the staff have to wear special clothes inside the institute and special rubber kit on entering the units where the experimental cattle are kept, there must be a laundry unit for the sterilization and cleansing of the clothing; disinfection tanks must be provided for the virus-infected effluent, and suitable installations made for the disinfection of manure; and there must be incineration for burning animals, as well as a small canning plant so as to salvage such meat as may be suitable for food.

Now it has been the experience at Pirbright that owing to insufficient accommodation for housing experimental animals and insufficient facilities, progress is relatively slow. There are so many problems which have to be tackled, when considering the setting up of a new research institute for the purpose under discussion, it should be appreciated at the start that it is no use tackling the problem half-heartedly. As only those who have worked intensively on foot-and-mouth disease can assess, the investigations are costly if reliable information is to be forthcoming and gratifying results produced. It is exceedingly costly by virtue of all the special demands which are made in this type of research for efficient control and disinfection and it must be, of necessity, planned on a long-term basis.

Although by experiments on small experimental animals much useful information can be obtained about the disease, in the light of our present state of knowledge, extensive experiments on cattle are very necessary.

There must also be ratproof fencing, changing rooms and baths for personnel at the entrance to the experimental units, all these additional to all the laboratories, services, administrative offices, a library, etc., which are required in the usual type of bacteriological research. There have to be large buildings for storing cattle for long-term duration of resistance tests after vaccination and also similar housing for cattle immune to the different types of virus. There are at least three different types of virus, and recovery from infection with one will not prevent an animal becoming infected with the second or third type; these type-resistant cattle are used for distinguishing the types of virus recovered from outbreaks in the field. The existence of the three types of virus requires the attendance of a specially selected and trained staff. Let it be reiterated that the research has to be planned on a long-term basis and the provision of accommodations must be liberal and adequate to insure that the work is not held up by bottlenecks. Some major experiments in cattle may take 2 or 3 months to complete and the cattle concerned have to be under examination in closed units during this time. If only a limited number of units are provided, it is not difficult to see how the rate of progress must be diminished.

The CHAIRMAN. Have you analyzed the bill?

Dr. SIMMS. Yes, sir. This statement tells what we have in mind to do under the provisions made in this bill.

We realize, of course, that with foot-and-mouth disease in Mexico and with it there at least for a long time, our situation in this country is different from what it was 5 or 10 years ago. We have never worked

with foot-and-mouth disease in the United States in experiments or research work in the past, our attitude being that we would rather not bring the actual virus of the disease into our laboratories.

Now, however, with the disease adjacent to us, we feel that we should do work and we feel that it should be done here at home where we will have full control of everything that is done.

In addition to the work that we plan on doing at home, we expect to work in conjunction and in collaboration with the laboratories in Europe. We have already made tentative arrangements with the European laboratories to send some of our people there to work with them. We are already under way with work to be done in Mexico.

However, those Mexican and European programs are relatively short time. We want to do work on a long-time basis and we think that it should be done where we will have full control.

In the statement that we have filed with you we have set forth the reasons for that and the methods of procedure that we intend to follow. Attached to that there is a statement from Dr. Galloway who is in charge of the foot-and-mouth disease research laboratory in England. They have maintained a laboratory over there for more than 20 years. Dr. Galloway has been in consultation with us. He has visited us twice and we have had two men in his laboratory within the last 6 months.

I think, unless the committee should like to ask some questions, that I will not enlarge on what is already present in this statement. I know you are very busy.

Senator BUSHFIELD. Doctor, I assume from what you said that you have not complete control, part of it goes to Mexico?

Dr. SIMMS. I beg your pardon, Senator.

Senator BUSHFIELD. I assume we do not have complete control of this thing?

Dr. SIMMS. I am speaking now strictly of research work. We feel that any research laboratory that should be set up in any other country would not be under our complete control.

Senator BUSHFIELD. Where do you propose to set up these laboratories, outside of the United States?

Dr. SIMMS. If this bill is passed, we are proposing to set up a laboratory somewhere probably on an island or a peninsula. The chances are we would go on a peninsula.

Senator BUSHFIELD. I understand that Puerto Rico is very much opposed to it.

Dr. SIMMS. As a matter of fact, the Department of Agriculture has not considered seriously going to Puerto Rico. That has been suggested to us but we have not, and I am sure that I can speak for the Secretary in this connection, given serious consideration to going to Puerto Rico.

Senator ELLENDER. Dr. Simms, does the Department of Agriculture think that it is necessary that such legislation be enacted? Has not the Secretary of Agriculture certain powers under which he could do this without special legislation?

Dr. SIMMS. I believe that is true. I think we could proceed with this work but it is of such importance that we feel the Congress should at least approve this work before we start it.

The CHAIRMAN. You say that you feel Congress should approve this work before you start it?

Dr. SIMMS. The bill does give specific authority for the work to be done.

Senator THYE. The bill amends certain sanitation laws that are on the statute books now.

Dr. SIMMS. That is correct.

Senator THYE. And those sanitation laws would not permit you to work with the live virus on the continent of the United States?

Dr. SIMMS. They would allow us to work with the live virus on the continent of the United States.

Senator THYE. Do you mean the old sanitation laws?

Dr. SIMMS. I think they would.

Senator THYE. Why do you propose to amend the law now?

Senator ELLENDER. That is a question I was asking. I do not see any necessity for it.

Senator THYE. That is why I ask the question. If they had the authority and the right to work with the live virus on the North American Continent or within the United States, then why did the Department of Agriculture ask me to introduce the bill?

Dr. SIMMS. It has been our feeling that a matter as important as this should have the endorsement of the Congress and, of course, if the work is done there must be an appropriation of funds for it.

Senator THYE. I realize that an appropriation is necessary to permit you to go into Mexico in the eradication program there and permit you to establish a research laboratory within Mexico and conduct any research activities that you might desire, but when you state here, "to amend the act of May 29, 1884," that would indicate to me that you are amending the sanitation laws. What is the proposed amendment to the act of May 29, 1884, for if it is not to permit you to work in a new field, so to speak?

Dr. SIMMS. That is what it is for. We have not consulted the Solicitor on this. We have not consulted as to whether it is illegal at the present time but it would be my interpretation that at the present time we do have the authority to work with the foot-and-mouth disease virus in the United States.

Senator ELLENDER. As a matter of fact, is it not true, Dr. Simms, that all you need, if you do not have the money, is simply an appropriation, to go on with the work?

Dr. SIMMS. That is true.

Senator ELLENDER. Could not that be provided in a pending deficiency bill in the House so that this work could go on immediately without the necessity of putting this new statute on the books?

Dr. SIMMS. We have already the authority to carry on and are already under way with the program that is set up here in this statement that says "Research which is being undertaken immediately." That is to be implemented at the present time. That work is already being done.

Senator THYE. You are amending the act by adding another section to the act; you are not amending the language of your sanitation laws.

Dr. SIMMS. No, sir.

Senator THYE. You are just adding another section.

Dr. SIMMS. Adding a section that would specifically state that work could be done.

Senator THYE. Authorizing you to acquire the land and erect the necessary buildings.

Dr. SIMMS. That is right.

Senator THYE. In other words, you know now that you have that authority but you feel you would be on firmer ground against future criticism if the added chapter was adopted specifying what you should do with that money?

Dr. SIMMS. You have expressed our opinion exactly.

Senator THYE. Personally, I have criticized the fact that we had not been in the field of research at an earlier time. We have just felt that we were surrounded by water and a country free of disease such as Mexico was and therefore we could keep ourselves isolated, but we did not go into the field of research in the manner we should have. I criticized the department last spring for that and I think you should now exercise every effort toward developing the research activity. If that disease hits this country, a billion dollars would only be a drop in the bucket in trying to cope with it. Every step that is taken as a protection and safeguard is warranted.

Senator BUSHFIELD. Dr. Simms, how much is this proposal going to cost?

Dr. SIMMS. We have drawn plans for the buildings and the estimates that the architects gave us, and of course these are just estimates on the floor plans so we cannot say they are very firm, or that the cost of the buildings and the equipment would run between \$25,000,000 and \$30,000,000. We know that sounds very high.

Senator BUSHFIELD. It is high.

Dr. SIMMS. It is very high, but I would like to call attention to the fact that the buildings must be given every bit of equipment which will prevent the escape of the disease from the quarters. For instance, we expect to have a fence, a concrete wall around the buildings with a woven wire fence above that so as to exclude all rodents from getting on the premises at all.

Senator BUSHFIELD. I see by this bill that you propose to employ only five people. Is that correct?

Dr. SIMMS. No, sir. Not more than five people would be employed above the limit of \$10,000.

Senator ELLENDER. That is it.

Senator BUSHFIELD. \$25,000,000 or \$30,000,000 will employ quite a lot of people.

Dr. SIMMS. That is the cost of the buildings and equipment. That is not the annual operating budget. That is the establishment of the plan which will take probably a period of as long as 3 years to get the plans drawn and to get the buildings completed.

The CHAIRMAN. In your opinion, Dr. Simms, you think we ought to spend the money?

Dr. SIMMS. I think it will be money well spent, Senator.

Senator ELLENDER. I do not want to be misunderstood by my questions, because I am against the bill. I think you should have authority and I think it is so important that it should have been done a long time ago instead of waiting until you had more authority from Congress.

As I see this, you simply try to pass the buck back to Congress. You have had authority for quite a while to do this work and all that was necessary was to obtain an appropriation from Congress.

Do you not think it is going to establish a rather bad precedent for us to fix the limit of the salaries of these men at \$15,000 when it is

now only \$10,000? In other words, how will you and other members of the Department of Agriculture feel if we raise the salaries of these five men when you who do just as much work, if not more than they, and that also applies to the other departments, only get \$10,000?

Dr. SIMMS. I think it is very important that we break that salary, that salary limit.

Senator ELLENDER. This is simply opening the door to make it possible for all to come in at \$15,000, which may be all right, but personally I believe it is establishing a precedent whereby others will be justified in asking for similar treatment accorded these people.

I would rather have it done in a general bill that applied to all rather than to only five.

Senator THYE. Dr. Simms, have you someone or certain individuals specifically in mind that you know you could not get for \$10,000?

Dr. SIMMS. The man we have in mind, whom we would like to put on this job if we can get him, now gets \$12,000 a year.

Senator THYE. Is he here on the continent?

Dr. SIMMS. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. The heads of the departments are in favor of this program?

Dr. SIMMS. Yes, sir.

Senator BUSHFIELD. I am interested in what Senator Ellender said. If five of your people are getting \$15,000, how are you going to justify not raising the salary of other employees?

Dr. SIMMS. We will justify it in this way: This is highly specialized work. It requires men of long training and highly specialized training.

Senator THYE. Those engaged in atomic bomb research work could say the same identical thing. The man engaged in the National Health Department could say the same thing.

Dr. SIMMS. That is correct.

Senator THYE. In fact, I would have to cross my fingers and say I could not face any other technical expert in any other department with a positive "No," if this were granted to men engaged in livestock research.

Dr. SIMMS. There is this other feature. I would like to call attention to this other feature. These men will live under rather trying conditions. Working in this laboratory will mean that they will be pretty well isolated.

Senator THYE. However, they can come off.

Dr. SIMMS. They can come off, but their work will be under rather definitely trying conditions.

Senator THYE. Well, Doctor, the man that goes in and subjects himself to the atomic-energy influences and whose life can be snuffed out by the very accident of just one misplaced finger certainly is in a more trying situation than one working with a cattle disease to which he himself cannot be subject.

Senator ELLENDER. On the other hand, Dr. Simms, is it not true that the members of your department who do work of this kind are accorded extra pay, for instance, a per diem? They would be away from their homes. For this they get extra compensation compared to what you get.

Dr. SIMMS. Yes; men who do work of this kind away from home would get per diem, but these people would not get the per diem as they would be stationed in their laboratory.

Senator ELLENDER. That would be their home?

Dr. SIMMS. Yes; that would be their station and they would get no living allowances.

I would say frankly that the top men that we would want to get on this job would not be available at the present salary limits.

Senator THYE. Dr. Simms, we are confronted with the same question in every department of our National Government, and I think that, so far as this bill is concerned, it should not carry that controversial question, because the bill would never pass the Senate with that provision. The bill should be amended to strike out the stipulation of salary.

Senator ELLENDER. On page 2, line 8, strike out the colon and place in lieu thereof a period, then strike out from the colon on line 8 the rest of the line, all of line 9 and line 10 up to the period.

Senator THYE. That is correct.

The CHAIRMAN. You have heard the motion. Are there any remarks? If not, those in favor of the motion will say "Aye."

(General response.)

The CHAIRMAN. Contrary "No."

(No response.)

Senator ELLENDER. I move that the bill as amended be reported favorably.

The CHAIRMAN. You have heard Senator Ellender's motion. Are you ready for the question?

Senator ELLENDER. I have Senator Hoey's proxy to vote for it.

Senator THYE. And I have Senator Aiken's proxy.

Senator BUSHFIELD. I did not know that we had any proxies.

Senator THYE. Senator Aiken expressed his desire to vote favorably, and that he would come back to vote. He had been here to establish the quorum and said he would be back. Nevertheless he left his favorable opinion.

The CHAIRMAN. All those in favor of Senator Ellender's motion will please say "Aye."

(General response.)

The CHAIRMAN. Contrary "No."

(No response.)

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you very much, Dr. Simms.

That will conclude our hearing on this bill.

(Whereupon, at 11:45 a. m., the hearing was adjourned.)

Daily Digest

HIGHLIGHTS

Senate passed synthetic-fuel and maritime bills and debated St. Lawrence Seaway.

Continuation of Armed Services investigation approved by House.

Senate groups approved bills on rent control continuation, foot-and-mouth disease, and antidiscrimination.

See Congressional Program Ahead.

Senate

Chamber Action

Routine Proceedings, pages 1139-1143

Bills Introduced: Six bills and two resolutions were introduced, as follows: S. 2131 to S. 2136; S. Res. 195 and S. Res. 196. Pages 1140-1142

Bills Reported: Reports were made as follows: S. 1795, to repeal certain regulations governing inquiries to be made in connection with disbursements by disbursing officers of the Army (S. Rept. 884). Page 1140

Bill Referred: House-passed bill H. R. 5214 was referred to the Committee on Appropriations. (For passage in House, see Digest, p. D95.) Page 1140

Resolutions Passed: The Senate passed the following resolutions:

S. Res. 195, providing for the printing of 1,000 additional copies of the hearings held on the European recovery program, for the use of the Foreign Relations Committee;

S. Con. Res. 39 and S. Con. Res. 40, relative to joint session in commemoration of fiftieth anniversary of victory over Spain, and termination of the Joint Committee on Observance and Celebration of Victory Over Spain on May 19, 1948; S. Con. Res. 41, fiftieth anniversary of sinking of U. S. Battleship *Maine*; and

H. Con. Res. 146, authorizing certain corrections to be made on H. R. 1634, D. C. life-insurance regulations bill. Pages 1140-1142

Synthetic Fuels: Senate passed S. 134, to authorize an additional \$30,000,000 for construction and operation of demonstration plants to produce synthetic liquid fuels from coal, oil shales, agricultural and forestry products, and other substances. Pages 1161-1175

Maritime: Passed S. J. Res. 173, to continue to July 1, 1949, the authority of the Maritime Commission to sell, charter, and operate vessels, with amendments. Pages 1180-1182

Committee Assignment: Senator Dworshak was assigned to the Committee on the District of Columbia. Page 1140

Program for Monday: Senate recessed at 5:09 p. m. until noon Monday, February 9.

Committee Meetings

(Committees not listed did not meet)

FOOT-AND-MOUTH DISEASE—LONG-RANGE FARM PROGRAM

Committee on Agriculture and Forestry: Committee approved for reporting to the Senate S. 2038, to conduct research on foot-and-mouth disease, with amendment.

The committee approved the long-range farm program report, providing for its release on Sunday, February 8, and will make the report to the Senate on February 9.

The committee will begin hearings next week on margin requirements of transactions in the commodity market.

RECLAMATION

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Interior continued its investigation into various reclamation projects on the Friant-Kern Canal of the Central Valley project, with the witnesses at yesterday's session continuing their testimony.

FOOT-AND-MOUTH DISEASE

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee heard Charles U. Duckworth, California State Department of Agriculture, discuss the foot-and-mouth disease problem in Mexico, as related to similar problems in California. He urged an investigation of means of stopping the spread of this disease in Mexico.

HOUSING AND RENTS

Committee on Banking and Currency: Subcommittee unanimously agreed to report to the full committee a bill to provide for an extension of rent control. Details on bill were not announced. Subcommittee will report to the full committee tomorrow afternoon in executive session.

PRICE CONTROL AND STABILIZATION

Committee on Banking and Currency: Continuing hearings on price control and stabilization bills (S. 1873, S. 1888, S. 1923, S. 1967, and S. 2023), committee heard R. H. Loudon, McGean Chemical Co.; Russell F. Duncan, manager, Ferro Enamel Corp.; and Charles R. Landback, Taylor, Smith & Taylor Co., testify in opposition to S. 2023 as it affects the allocation and control of tin and tin products. T. J. Wood, vice president, Procter & Gamble Co., gave reason for rise in prices of their products; F. W. Paget, Standard Brands, Inc., stated that he could find no evidence that there were high profits in the processing and distribution functions of their commodities.

MARSHALL PLAN

Committee on Foreign Relations: Committee concluded hearings today on the proposed European recovery program, after receiving testimony in its support from the following witnesses: Walter P. Reuther, UAW-CIO; former Representative Hamilton Fish; and Benjamin A. Javits, New York. Committee meets in executive session on February 9 to begin preparation of a bill for reporting.

NATURAL GAS

Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce: Subcommittee continued its hearings on H. R. 4051, amending Natural Gas Act relative to jurisdiction of Federal Power Commission fixing rates for sale of natural gas in interstate commerce, with the following witnesses testifying: Edward Falck, Independent Natural Gas

Association of America; Nelson Lee Smith, Chairman, and Harrington Wimberly, Commissioner, FPC. Hearings continue tomorrow.

ANTIDISCRIMINATION

Committee on Labor and Public Welfare: By a vote of 7 to 5 the committee, in executive session, agreed to report, without amendment, S. 984, to prohibit discrimination in employment because of race, religion, or color.

Committee also received 70 public-health nominations.

PUBLIC HEALTH

Committee on Labor and Public Welfare: I. S. Falk, Director, Bureau of Research and Statistics of Social Security Administration, continued his testimony on S. 1320, to provide a national health insurance and public health program, before the Subcommittee on Health.

REA PERSONNEL

Committee on Post Office and Civil Service: Subcommittee, in connection with S. Res. 41, met to explore charges of political activity in REA and to consider classification and salary of REA engineers, receiving testimony from REA Administrator Claude R. Wickard; William J. Neal, Deputy Administrator; Civil Service Commissioner Arthur S. Flemming; and Ismar Baruch, Chief of Personnel Classification Division, together with testimony from eight engineers, two counsels, and eight members of Board of Directors, all of REA cooperatives.

GAO BUILDING

Committee on Public Works: Subcommittee on Public Buildings heard testimony in support of H. R. 4068, authorizing the construction of a new GAO building in the District of Columbia, by William E. Reynolds, Commissioner of Public Buildings, and Frank L. Yates, Assistant Comptroller, GAO.

House of Representatives

Chamber Action

Bills Introduced: Ten public bills, H. R. 5292-5301; three private bills, H. R. 5302-5304; and four resolutions, H. Res. 458-461, were introduced.

Pages 1187, 1198

Bills Reported: Reports were made as follows:

H. R. 2803, relief of Miriam Barkle (H. Rept. 1342);
H. Res. 458, rule providing time for general debate and consideration of amendments to H. J. Res. 296, maintaining status quo in respect to certain employ-

ment taxes and social-security benefits pending congressional action (H. Rept. 1343);

H. Res. 459, rule providing time for general debate and consideration of amendments to H. J. Res. 275, authorizing loans to fur farmers (H. Rept. 1344);

S. 1252, making certain changes in the organization of the Navy Department (H. Rept. 1345);

S. 1673, authorizing promotion of James Y. Parker, as major, AUS, as of March 1, 1942 (H. Rept. 1346);

H. R. 1275, authorizing reimbursement of naval personnel for cost of necessary medical or hospital services while on authorized leave (H. Rept. 1347);

ENABLING THE SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE TO CONDUCT
RESEARCH ON FOOT-AND-MOUTH DISEASE AND OTHER DIS-
EASES OF ANIMALS AND TO AMEND THE ACT OF MAY 29, 1884
(23 STAT. 31), AS AMENDED, BY ADDING ANOTHER SECTION

FEBRUARY 9 (legislative day, FEBRUARY 2), 1948.—Ordered to be printed

Mr. CAPPER, from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry,
submitted the following

REPORT

[To accompany S. 2038]

The Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, to whom was referred the bill (S. 2038) to enable the Secretary of Agriculture to conduct research on foot-and-mouth disease and other diseases of animals and to amend the act of May 29, 1884 (23 Stat. 31), as amended, by adding another section, having considered the same, report thereon with a recommendation that it do pass with an amendment.

On page 2, lines 8 to 10, strike out the words "Act: *Provided*, That the number so employed shall not exceed five and that the maximum compensation for each shall not exceed \$15,000 per annum." and insert in lieu thereof the word "Act."

A copy of a letter received from Secretary Clinton P. Anderson of the Department of Agriculture concerning this legislation is attached hereto and made a part of said report.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
Washington, D. C., February 6, 1948.

HON. ARTHUR CAPPER,
Chairman, Committee on Agriculture and Forestry,
United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR: This is in reply to your request of January 22 for a report on S. 2038, a bill to enable the Secretary of Agriculture to conduct research on foot-and-mouth disease and other diseases of animals and to amend the act of May 29, 1884 (23 Stat. 31), as amended, by adding another section. The bill authorizes the appropriation of such sums as Congress may deem necessary and in addition, it contains authority for the Secretary of Agriculture to utilize, in carrying out the purposes of the bill, funds otherwise available for the control or eradication of the specified animal diseases.

Foot-and-mouth disease has occurred in the United States six times within the past 50 years. Each time it has been eradicated by prompt and drastic action by Federal and State livestock disease control officials at considerable cost of money expended and livestock destroyed. More frequent outbreaks have been prevented by the application of strict controls exercised over the importation of susceptible animals, the products of such animals, and other substances such as hay, straw, and the like, which might carry the virus of the disease. The last outbreak occurred in the United States in 1929.

As a further protection to the livestock of the United States the other countries of North America also have been free of foot-and-mouth disease until late in 1946 when the disease was diagnosed in Mexico. Since that time foot-and-mouth disease has spread over the central one-third of Mexico and is now endemic in that area. Large-scale cooperative efforts by the Governments of Mexico and the United States have been successful thus far to contain the disease within the central part of Mexico but have not been successful to stamp it out. Accordingly, we now have within 300 miles of our border a large area infected with foot-and-mouth disease from which the disease may escape and reach into the United States.

Research on foot-and-mouth disease has never been conducted in the United States because it was felt that the remoteness of the danger and the effectiveness of the control and eradication measures made it not worth while to assume the risks of experimenting with the disease in this country. Now that danger is no longer remote. It is close by. We are faced with the possibility of having to combat the disease regularly rather than at infrequent intervals. If the disease should come into the United States, the same eradication measures that have been used in the past would be energetically applied. However, it is also recognized that there is much that can be learned about this disease through research. The extent of the knowledge that can be thus gained can only be estimated at this time. It is quite possible that such knowledge will be of priceless value to this country in fighting the disease in the future. Although much research has been done in other countries and a great deal of information accumulated about the disease, we do not think it is sufficient to continue to rely upon the research of others. This country must throw its skills and researches into the endeavor to finally conquer foot-and-mouth disease.

Department scientists have in the past worked on this problem in the laboratories in other countries. However, since 1926, this has not been on a large scale. Under the proposal in S. 2038, it would be our plan to establish in the United States at a suitable location a modern research institute where full study of all phases of the disease could be undertaken. The most suitable location would be on a peninsula, from which traffic to the mainland could be carefully guarded. Taking full advantage of the experiences of others in protecting their research laboratories against the accidental escape of the virus, the institute to be established here would be equipped with every safeguard to give to the livestock industry of this country an assurance that the virus would have no reasonable chance for escape. Preliminary plans for the laboratory have been sketched out and are being perfected.

In recruiting scientific personnel for the laboratory, it is essential, we think, that extreme care be exercised and employment given only to those who, in addition to having the requisite education and training, are also included toward research in their particular field. Likewise, selection should be made of those persons, otherwise qualified, who do not have family obligations which would mitigate against ready and continued acceptance of the restrictions of service in such a laboratory. [As stated above, the laboratory would be operated with every possible safeguard against the escape of the virus, including very stringent sanitary measures, and absolute adherence to the safety provisions will be made a condition of employment. It is essential, therefore, that we be in position to terminate forthwith the appointment of any employee at the time of the first infringement of any of the established safeguards.]

In order to accomplish these matters, it is suggested that S. 2038 be amended by deleting the sentence beginning on line 5, page 2, and substituting in place thereof the following:

"To carry out the provisions of this section the Secretary is authorized to make appointments without regard to the civil service laws or regulations, and, when in his opinion the protection of the livestock industry in the United States so requires, to terminate such appointments without regard to the provisions of law relating to the removal of Federal employees. The Secretary is further authorized in carrying out such provisions to employ technical experts or scientists without

regard to the Classification Act of 1923, as amended: *Provided*, That the number so employed shall not exceed five and that the maximum compensation for each shall not exceed \$15,000 per annum."

This Department recommends that the bill, amended as above, be passed. A similar bill, H. R. 5098, has been introduced in the House by the Honorable George W. Gillie, of Indiana. Department representatives appeared before the Subcommittee on Foot-and-Mouth Disease of the House Committee on Agriculture in favor of this latter bill at hearings held on January 26 and 27.

In view of the time situation, we have not obtained from the Bureau of the Budget advice as to the relationship of this proposed legislation, or report thereon, to the program of the President.

Sincerely yours,

CLINTON P. ANDERSON,
Secretary.



80TH CONGRESS
2D SESSION

Calendar No. 932

S. 2038

[Report No. 886]

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

JANUARY 21, 1948

Mr. THYE introduced the following bill; which was read twice and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry

FEBRUARY 9 (legislative day, FEBRUARY 2), 1948

Reported by Mr. CAPPER, with an amendment

[Omit the part struck through and insert the part printed in italic]

A BILL

To enable the Secretary of Agriculture to conduct research on foot-and-mouth disease and other diseases of animals and to amend the Act of May 29, 1884 (23 Stat. 31), as amended, by adding another section.

1 *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representa-*
2 *tives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*
3 That the Act of May 29, 1884 (23 Stat. 31), as amended,
4 is hereby amended by adding thereto section 12.

5 “SEC. 12. The Secretary of Agriculture is authorized
6 to establish research laboratories, including the acquisition of
7 necessary land, buildings, or facilities, and also the making
8 of research contracts under the authority contained in sec-
9 tion 10 (a) of the Bankhead-Jones Act of 1935 as amended

1 by the Research and Marketing Act of 1946, for research
2 and study, in the United States or elsewhere, of foot-and-
3 mouth disease and other animal diseases which, in the
4 opinion of the Secretary, constitute a threat to the livestock
5 industry of the United States. To carry out the provisions
6 of this section, the Secretary is authorized to employ tech-
7 nical experts or scientists without regard to the Classifica-
8 tion ~~Act~~: *Provided*, That the number so employed shall
9 not exceed five and that the maximum compensation for
10 each shall not exceed \$15,000 per annum *Act*. There is
11 hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as Congress
12 may deem necessary; in addition, the Secretary is authorized
13 to utilize, in carrying out this section, funds otherwise avail-
14 able for the control or eradication of such diseases.”

80TH CONGRESS
2^D SESSION

S. 2038

[Report No. 886]

A BILL

To enable the Secretary of Agriculture to conduct research on foot-and-mouth disease and other diseases of animals and to amend the Act of May 29, 1884 (23 Stat. 31), as amended, by adding another section.

By Mr. THYE.

JANUARY 21, 1948

Read twice and referred to the Committee on
Agriculture and Forestry

FEBRUARY 9 (legislative day, FEBRUARY 2), 1948

Reported with an amendment

80TH CONGRESS
2D SESSION

H. R. 5539

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

FEBRUARY 24, 1948

Mr. WORLEY introduced the following bill; which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture

A BILL

To enable the Secretary of Agriculture to conduct research on foot-and-mouth disease and other diseases of animals and to amend the Act of May 29, 1884 (23 Stat. 31), as amended, by adding another section.

1 *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representa-*
2 *tives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*
3 That the Act of May 29, 1884 (23 Stat. 31), as amended,
4 is hereby amended by adding a new section 12 reading as
5 follows:

6 "SEC. 12. The Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to
7 establish research laboratories, including the acquisition of
8 necessary land, buildings, or facilities, and also the making
9 of research contracts under the authority contained in sec-

tion 10 (a) of the Bankhead-Jones Act of 1935, as amended by the Research and Marketing Act of 1946, for research and study, in the United States or elsewhere, of animal diseases which in the opinion of the Secretary constitute a threat to the livestock industry of the United States: *Provided*, That no live virus of the foot-and-mouth disease shall be imported or allowed to enter the continental limits of the United States for any purpose: *Provided further*, That in the event of an outbreak of foot-and-mouth disease within the continental limits of the United States, the Secretary of Agriculture may, in his discretion, permit the entry or importation of said virus. To carry out the provisions of this section, the Secretary is authorized to employ technical experts or scientists without regard to the Classification Act: *And provided further*, That the number so employed shall not exceed five and that the maximum compensation for each shall not exceed \$15,000 per annum. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as Congress may deem necessary; in addition, the Secretary is authorized to utilize, in carrying out this section, funds otherwise available for the control or eradication of such diseases."

80TH CONGRESS
2D Session

H. R. 5539

A BILL

To enable the Secretary of Agriculture to conduct research on foot-and-mouth disease and other diseases of animals and to amend the Act of May 29, 1884 (23 Stat. 31), as amended, by adding another section.

By Mr. WORLEY

FEBRUARY 24, 1948

Referred to the Committee on Agriculture

- DIGEST OF
CONGRESSIONAL PROCEEDINGS
OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND FINANCE

Division of Legislative Reports
(For Department staff only)

Issued February 26, 1948

For actions of February 25, 1948

80th-2nd, No. 35

CONTENTS.

Alcohol.....12	Fertilizers..... 2	Organization, executive..13
Appropriations.....12,17,18	Flood control.....18	Personnel.....12,31
Archives..... 4	Foreign affairs.	Prices, farm.....14,15
Budgeting.....5,10	Relief.....27	Remount service..... 8
Crop insurance.....29	Forests and forestry...6,12	Research
Education.....25	Furs.....12	Animal industry..... 1
Electrification.....21	Grain.....2,9,12,15	Rubber.....22
Electrification, rural...30	Housing.....11	Soil conservation.....19
Emergency powers.....2,9,24	Inflation.....20	Textiles.....23
Expenditures.....10	Information.....3,28	Tobacco..... 7
Farm program.....10	Lands, reclamation...10,12	Trade, foreign.....2,17
Fats and oils..... 2	Loans, farm.....12	Transportation.....16,26
Federal aid.....25	Livestock and meat..... 1	Veterans' benefits...11,31

HIGHLIGHTS: Senate passed foot-and-mouth disease research bill. Senate debated bill to authorize grain allocation for alcohol production. Sen. Thomas (Okla.) spoke against Remount Service bill. Senate passed bill to continue export-control and allocation powers. Sen. Lucas criticized various Congressional investigations. Rep. Hone said reduced wheat prices are not reflected in reduced bread prices. Rep. Lenke urged cost-of-production floor for farm prices. Rep. Cooley introduced bill to amend Crop Insurance Act.

SENATE

1. FOOT-AND-MOUTH DISEASE. Passed with amendments S. 2038, to authorize this Department to conduct research on this disease. Agreed to the committee amendment regarding employment outside of the Classification Act. Agreed to an amendment by Sen. Knowland, Calif., to provide that the laboratory shall be located "on an island or other isolated area adequate to guard against the accidental spread of the virus." (pp. 1744, 1750-1.)
2. EXPORT CONTROLS; ALLOCATIONS. Passed with amendment H.R. 5391, to continue allocation powers over certain materials, including tin; import controls over fats and oils, rice, nitrogen fertilizers, etc.; and export controls over certain fibers, petroleum, etc. under the Second Decontrol Act of 1947. Agreed to an amendment by Sen. Taft, Ohio, to continue these powers until May 31, 1948, instead of Mar. 31, 1948, the House date. (p. 1745.)
3. LIBRARY DEMONSTRATION. Passed without amendment S. 48, to provide for demonstration of public library service in areas without such service or with inadequate library facilities (p. 1742).
4. ARCHIVES. Passed without amendment H.R. 1350, to facilitate transfer to the custody of the Archivist of records no longer needed in current business of the various agencies (p. 1743). This bill will now be sent to the President.
5. BUDGET. Sen. Aiken, Vt., explained the Expenditures in Executive Departments Committee condensation of the Federal budget and discussed various phases of

the report with Sen. Hayden, Ariz. (pp. 1721-2).

6. NATIONAL FORESTS. Reported without amendment H.R. 3175, to add certain public and other lands to the Shasta National Forest, Calif. (S.Rept. 928) (p. 1718).
7. TOBACCO. Received a Ky. Legislature resolution requesting USDA to rescind the order directing a 10-percent reduction in burley-tobacco acreage. To Agriculture and Forestry Committee. (p. 1717.)
8. REMOUNT SERVICE. Passed over on objection of Sen. Thomas, Okla., H.R. 3484, to transfer the Remount Service from the Army Department to USDA (pp. 1741, 1749-50). Sen. Thomas stated that he had no objection to the transfer of the stations in Virginia, Nebraska, and Calif., but thought the station in Okla. should be "made available for subdivision and use under the provisions of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act." He further stated that he thought the bill should be referred to the Agriculture and Forestry Committee (pp. 1749-50).
9. GRAIN ALLOCATION. Began debate on S.J.Res. 186, to authorize allocation and inventory control of grain for the production of ethyl alcohol (pp. 1751-6). Earlier the resolution had been passed over on a call of the calendar at the request of Sen. Capehart, Ind. (pp. 1746-7).
10. INVESTIGATIONS. Rejected Sen. Lucas' motion to reconsider the vote by which the Senate agreed to S. Res. 189, which makes \$125,000 available to the Expenditures in the Executive Departments Committee for investigations, etc. Sen. Lucas criticized various Congressional investigations, claimed that the cost of Congress has gone up greatly under the Republicans, stated that "the President's 1948 budget will not have been cut by a single dollar", and said it would be possible under this resolution for the Expenditures Committee to "investigate the farm program if it wants to." Chairman Aiken of the Expenditures Committee debated several of these points with Sen. Lucas. Sen. Knowland charged that the Reclamation Bureau made false statements during appropriation hearings. Sen. Lucas presented and discussed S. Con. Res. 44, to provide various protections and rights for witnesses at hearings before investigating committees. (pp. 1727-40).
11. HOUSING. Sen. Johnston, S.C., urged legislation to authorize RFC to purchase home loans guaranteed or insured under the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 (pp. 1656-7).
12. BILLS PASSED OVER: The following were among the bills passed over:
 - S. 669, to provide for the payment of a bonus of 30¢ a bushel on wheat and corn produced and sold between Jan. 1, 1945 and April 18, 1946 (p. 1740).
 - S. 299, to extend the reclamation laws to Arkansas (p. 1741).
 - S. Con. Res. 6, to include all general appropriation bills in one consolidated appropriation bill (p. 1741).
 - S. 430, to cover national farm loan associations and production credit association employees under the Civil Service Retirement Act. (p. 1743).
 - S.J.Res. 164, to authorize RACC to make loans to fur farmers (p. 1743).
 - At the request of Sen. Cordon, Zore., H.R. 1809, to facilitate the use and occupancy of national forest lands (p. 1747).
 - S. 2142, to transfer the Muscatine, Iowa, alcohol plant to USDA for processing agricultural commodities (p. 1748).

HOUSE

13. EXECUTIVE REORGANIZATION. Agreed to H. Con. Res. 131, which would disapprove the President's Reorganization Plan No. 1, 1948, to transfer the U.S. Employment

Navy and of considerable importance to its maintenance programs, that the component units of the Naval Air Matériel Center continue to be available for service to these programs. Such service would be rendered impossible if it became necessary to use these establishments for the manufacture of 10 percent of the Navy's aircraft and engines.

2. This bill removes the limitation set forth in the Vinson-Trammell and associated acts that profits on contracts for the construction of naval vessels cannot exceed 10 percent and profits on contracts for both Army and Navy aircraft construction cannot exceed 12 percent.

It is a recognized fact that when a maximum profit is set by law such maximum-profit figure becomes a minimum-profit figure for the particular industries competing for the business. In compliance with the profit limitations provision it is necessary for the Government and contractor to conduct a complete cost analysis in order to determine the cost of the given vessel or aircraft so that the maximum profit limitation may be applied. This is an onerous and costly procedure even if the prime contractor is solely engaged in manufacturing for the Government. It is a common occurrence for the prime contractor to be simultaneously engaged in both private and Government contracts. This makes it necessary to conduct a cost analysis on the private-contract work in addition to the Government-contract work, so that the proportionate charge against the Government-contract work may be determined, and in each case the cost of auditing is expensive and becomes chargeable as a proper item of cost against the Government. This procedure increases prices to the Government. Recently the Senate passed H. R. 1366, the so-called procurement bill, which is expected to be signed by the President within a few days. The provisions of this act fully protect the Government on all matters of procurement.

3. This bill also removes the limitation that the first and each succeeding alternate vessel and the main engines, armor, and armament for such vessels should be constructed or manufactured in United States Government navy yards, gun factories, naval stations, ordnance plants, or arsenals. The committee, however, has amended the bill to provide that the President may have a vessel built in a Government or private yard, but it is the intent of the Congress that as fair and equal an allocation of new-vessel construction work as is practical be made between Government and private yards.

The continuance of such a limitation places the Navy Department in an inflexible and awkward position with respect to placing contracts for new ship construction. Depending on the nature of the construction and the existing work load, it is sometimes desirable to follow the above requirement. Also the Nation is now faced with the problem of maintaining a healthy private shipbuilding industry as an asset for national security. In addition to removal of the blind requirement for competition with private industry, the Navy Department, from the standpoints of design and type of ship concerned, should have the choice of determining whether a new vessel should be constructed in Government or private facilities to insure that both are used to the best advantage in obtaining ships of the most advanced type.

The primary function of the naval industrial establishments is to support the fleet. The first consideration in that respect involves maintenance, repair, preservation, and improvements in existing ships; the construction of new vessels is a secondary consideration to this primary function. In addition to the active fleet there is now a reserve fleet of approximately 5,000,000 tons.

I want to correct a typographical error appearing in the Senate Report No. 630 for this bill, near the top of page 4, wherein it states

that the Navy now has a reserve fleet of 500,000,000 tons. This should read "approximately 5,000,000 tons."

It is the opinion of the Navy Department that the maintenance and preservation of the active and reserve fleets will maintain all naval facilities which it is practicable to continue in operation at a level consistent with economy and available funds. In addition to this, special types, and types of ships classified for security reasons, will continue to be built in naval facilities. Construction of standard-type vessels for which specifications are clearly drawn is considered to be properly within the field of private industry. The Navy Department proposes that a fair and equal allocation of new-vessel construction work shall be made between Government and private yards insofar as it is possible, considering the conditions and procedures described above.

The fiscal effects of the repeal of the provisions as set out in the proposed legislation cannot be adequately determined; however, it is believed that no additional expense will be incurred by the Government and that savings may, in fact, be anticipated.

BILLS PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 1356) providing for the incorporation of the Franco-American War Veterans, was announced as next in order.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 430) to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act, approved May 29, 1930, as amended, so as to make such act applicable to officers and employees of national farm loan associations and production credit associations was announced as next in order.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 1557) to incorporate the Catholic War Veterans of the United States of America, was announced as next in order.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 1375) to incorporate the Jewish War Veterans of the United States of America, was announced as next in order.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (H. R. 3978) to provide for the temporary advancement in ranks and increase in salary of lieutenants in the Metropolitan Police force of the District of Columbia, serving as supervisors of certain squads, was announced as next in order.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 1663) to prohibit the payment of retirement annuities to former Members of Congress convicted of offenses involving the improper use of authority, influence, power, or privileges as Members of Congress, was announced as next in order.

Mr. LANGER. Over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 968) to authorize the Public Utilities Commission of the District of Columbia to limit the number of taxicabs licensed and operated in the Dis-

trict of Columbia, was announced as next in order.

Mr. LANGER. Over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (H. R. 4042) to control the export to foreign countries of gasoline and petroleum products from the United States, was announced as next in order.

Mr. LUCAS. Over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 1653) to control the export to foreign countries of gasoline and petroleum products from the United States, was announced as next in order.

Mr. LUCAS. Over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

NATIONAL ARCHIVES OF THE UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT

The bill (H. R. 1350) to amend the act entitled "An act to establish a National Archives of the United States Government, and for other purposes," was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 1015) to amend section 7 of the act of June 25, 1910, as amended, to reduce the interest rate on postal-savings deposits to 1 percent per annum, was announced as next in order.

Mr. LANGER. Over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 37) requesting the President to proclaim February 1 as National Freedom Day, was announced as next in order.

Mr. BARKLEY. Over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The joint resolution will be passed over.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 111) approving the agreement between the United States and Canada relating to the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Basin with the exception of certain provisions thereof, was announced as next in order.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The joint resolution will be passed over.

The bill (H. R. 2239) to amend section 13 (a) of the Surplus Property Act of 1944, as amended, was announced as next in order.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 1004) to amend the Atomic Energy Act of 1946, so as to provide that no person shall be appointed as a member of the Atomic Energy Commission or as general manager of such Commission until an investigation, with respect to character, associations, and loyalty of such person shall have been made by the FBI, was announced as next in order.

Mr. LUCAS. Over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 164) to authorize the Regional Agricultural Credit Corporation of Washington, District of Columbia, to make loans to fur farmers and for other purposes was announced as next in order.

Mr. LUCAS. Over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The joint resolution will be passed over.

FOOT-AND-MOUTH DISEASE RESEARCH

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2038) to enable the Secretary of Agriculture to conduct research on foot-and-mouth disease and other diseases of animals and to amend the act of May 29, 1884.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of the bill?

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, this bill would permit the acquisition of land, and would also authorize the establishment of a research laboratory in the United States to further the acquisition of knowledge regarding foot-and-mouth disease. The disease exists now in central Mexico, only a few hundred miles from the border of the United States. In the event there should be an outbreak of that disease in the United States, it could cost livestock farmers many million dollars. For that reason it is felt and recommended by the Department of Agriculture that a research laboratory should be established somewhere, either on an island adjacent to the United States, or within some area of the United States, so that research could be conducted, and so as to perfect the known vaccine which exists today, or develop some other type of vaccine to guard against the disease. That is the purpose of the bill.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Reserving the right to object, I should like to say to the able Senator from Minnesota that I fully recognize the importance of eradicating foot-and-mouth disease, because there was a very bad outbreak in my State of California in 1924 and in 1929, which resulted in the loss of tens of thousands of head of cattle to the farmers of the State. The State Department of Agriculture is very much concerned about the establishment of a laboratory within the continental confines of the United States. This virus is so infectious that if it should spread from a place which was not properly segregated it might cause untold loss to the livestock industry and dairy industry of the Nation. I was wondering whether the Senator would have any objection to an amendment which would limit the establishment of such a laboratory to an offshore island.

Mr. THYE. I should have no objection to such an amendment, but I call the Senator's attention to this fact: It has been brought to our notice that a peninsula could be found, and it might be possible to isolate the point of it so that those on the peninsula could have contact with the mainland, so to speak, and the laboratory would not be established on an island, leading to difficulty of navigating to and from the island, and necessitating the personnel having to be transported by boat to the island for the purpose of conducting the research activities. I think that if the Senator would examine the map he would probably find a peninsula which could be entirely segregated from the adjoining land, either by a fence or by a bridge. I could call his attention to such a peninsula if I cared to do so, but I do not think we should disclose the par-

ticular location at this time. That is why I do not desire to be specific.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I wonder if the Senator would object to having the bill go to the foot of the calendar.

Mr. THYE. I may say that delay in deciding this question is embarrassing to the Department of Agriculture. While I do not say that I would object to the bill going over today, if it should be delayed for another day, I would ask the Senator to examine the matter very carefully, because every minute of delay is jeopardizing the livestock industry of the United States.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I am fully alive to the importance of the problem; and if this bill called for an appropriation of funds to finance combating the disease and there were an emergent situation, I should not even hold the bill up and ask that it go to the end of the calendar today, but I should like to have a chance to examine the bill.

Mr. THYE. If the Senator will ask that it be placed at the end of the calendar, that will be satisfactory.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be placed at the end of the calendar.

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 2123) to exempt certain officers of the Regular Army and Regular Air Force from the provisions of statutes requiring retirement by reason of age, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. LANGER. Over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

TRANSPORTATION FOR CERTAIN GOVERNMENT AND OTHER PERSONNEL

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1525) to provide for furnishing transportation for certain Government and other personnel, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Armed Services with amendments.

The first committee amendment was, on page 1, line 3, after the words "Secretary of", to strike out "War or", and insert "the Army."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of the bill?

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, the purpose of the bill is to allow the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force to furnish bus transportation in places where commercial transportation is not available, such as experimental stations in desert areas, where we are now carrying on some experiments, to which commercial transportation is not possible. The bill would allow such service to be continued under the same powers as existed during wartime.

Mr. LANGER. Does the bill affect per diem payments?

Mr. GURNEY. No.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will state the next amendment.

The next amendment of the committee was on page 2, line 4, after the word "Navy", to insert "or the Secretary of the Air Force."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in paragraph 1, page 2, line 8, after the words

"by the", to strike out "War Department or Navy Department" and insert "Department of the Army, the Department of the Navy, or the Department of the Air Force"; in line 12, after the words "of the", to strike out "War Department or Navy Department," and insert "Department of the Army, the Department of the Navy, or the Department of the Air Force"; in line 18, after the words "Secretary of", to strike out "War or" and insert "the Army," and in line 19, after the word "Navy", to insert "or the Secretary of the Air Force."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in paragraph 2, page 3, line 3, after the words "Secretary of", to strike out "War or" and insert "the Army"; and in line 4, after the word "Navy", to insert "or the Secretary of the Air Force."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in paragraph 3, page 3, line 13, after the words "Secretary of", to strike out "War or" and insert "the Army"; and in line 14, after the word "Navy" to insert "or the Secretary of the Air Force."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in paragraph 4, on page 3, line 19, after the words "Secretary of", to strike out "War and" and insert "the Army"; in line 20, after the word "Navy", to insert "and the Secretary of the Air Force"; in line 22, after the words "Secretary of", to strike out "War or" and insert "the Army"; in line 23, after the word "Navy", to strike out "or the Secretary of the Air Force"; and on page 4, line 2, after the word "means", to insert "that reasonable effort has been made to induce operators of private facilities to provide the necessary service."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in section 2, page 4, line 8, after the words "Secretary of", to strike out "War and" and insert "the Army"; in line 9, after the word "Navy", to insert "and the Secretary of the Air Force"; in line 17, after the word "operation", to strike out "and"; in line 18, after the words "Secretary of", to strike out "War or" and insert "the Army"; in line 19, after the word "Navy", to insert "or the Secretary of the Air Force"; and in line 20, after the word "exercised", to insert a semicolon and the following: "and (5) for each activity for which transportation facilities were provided, the maximum number of motor vehicles or water carriers used, the total miles operated, the total revenue from fares or proceeds from the leasing or chartering of equipment, the operating and maintenance expense, depreciation, gross cost, and net cost."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That whenever the Secretary of the Army, the Secretary of the Navy, or the Secretary of the Air Force shall determine that the effective conduct of the affairs of his department requires assured and adequate transportation facilities to and from their places of employment for personnel attached to or employed by such department, including, during any period of war, personnel attached to or employed by private plants engaged in the manufacture

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will proceed to state the three bills which went to the end of the calendar.

TAX-EXEMPT PROPERTY IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (S. 1125) to define the real property exempt from taxation in the District of Columbia.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on the District of Columbia with amendments.

The first amendment of the committee was, on page 2, following section 2, to strike out:

SEC. 3. Paragraph (p) of section 1 of such act is amended to read as follows:

"(p) The building, or portion thereof, owned by a church and actually occupied and used as the episcopal residence of a bishop of such church."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 2, in line 23, after the word "Sec.", to strike out "4" and insert "3."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 3, in line 17, after the word "Sec.", to strike out "5" and insert "4."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CAIN. I offer the amendment to which I referred a few moments ago.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment offered by the Senator from Washington will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 3, in line 11, after the word "exemption", it is proposed to insert:

And provided further, That use of the exempted property or receipt of rent or income therefrom shall not deprive such property of exemption under the following circumstances:

(1) Where the owner of the property is an institution or organization entitled to exemption of its property under this act and a part of such property is made available without charge for use by other institutions or organizations whose property would be entitled to exemption under this act if owned by such other institutions or organizations;

(2) Where rent or income is received from indigent persons, inmates, patients, students, or others who are able to pay and who legitimately receive the benefits or services of an institution or organization entitled to exemption under this act; or

(3) Where rent or income is received from employees whose official duties require that they live in the property exempted in order to properly perform such duties.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Washington. The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill (S. 1125) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That paragraph (c) of section 1 of the act entitled "An act to define the real property exempt from tax-

tion in the District of Columbia," approved December 24, 1942 (56 Stat. 1089, ch. 826), as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"(c) Property belonging to foreign governments and used or held for legation purposes: *Provided*, That any such property not actually used for legation purposes shall be assessed and taxed unless the Secretary of State of the United States of America shall certify to the Commissioners of the District of Columbia that the property is held for legation purposes due to the exigencies of war or other emergency and that it is in the interests of the United States that the exemption of such property from taxation be continued."

SEC. 2. Paragraph (o) of section 1 of such act is amended to read as follows:

"(o) The building, or portion thereof, actually occupied and used as a pastoral residence by the pastor, rector, minister, or rabbi of a church: *Provided*, That such building be owned by the church or congregation for which said pastor, rector, minister, or rabbi officiates: *And provided further*, That not more than one such pastoral residence shall be exempt for any one church or congregation."

SEC. 3. Section 2 of such act is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 2. If any building or grounds, or portion thereof, entitled to exemption under the provisions of paragraphs (d) to (r) of section 1 of this act are not actually used by or for the activities of the institution or organization which owns such property and for the purposes for which exemption is granted, or are used to secure a rent or income of any character from any activity or use other than an activity or use which entitles such property to exemption under this act, such building or grounds, or portion thereof, shall be assessed and taxed: *Provided*, That lack of actual use of grounds exempted under section 1 (r) (2) of this act shall not deprive such grounds of exemption: *And provided further*, That use of the exempted property or receipt of rent or income therefrom shall not deprive such property of exemption under the following circumstances:

"(1) Where the owner of the property is an institution or organization entitled to exemption of its property under this act and a part of such property is made available without charge for use by other institutions or organizations whose property would be entitled to exemption under this act if owned by such other institutions or organizations;

"(2) Where rent or income is received from indigent persons, inmates, patients, students, or others who are able to pay and who legitimately receive the benefits or services of an institution or organization entitled to exemption under this act; or

"(3) Where rent or income is received from employees whose official duties require that they live in the property exempted in order to properly perform such duties. If the tax assessed is not paid and becomes delinquent, it shall be collected by sale of the whole lot or parcel of land, with improvements thereon, or otherwise in the same manner as taxes on other real property in the District of Columbia are collected."

SEC. 4. Section 5 of such act is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 5. Any institution, organization, corporation, or association aggrieved by any assessment of real property deemed to be exempt from taxation under the provisions of this act may appeal therefrom to the Board of Tax Appeals for the District of Columbia in the same manner and to the same extent as provided in sections 3 and 4 of title IX of the District of Columbia Revenue Act of 1937, as amended: *Provided, however*, That payment of the tax shall not be prerequisite to any such appeal. No appeal under this

section, nor any proceeding in any court, shall be filed or maintained to establish the exemption of any property deemed to be exempt unless, prior to July 1 of the fiscal year involved in any case, written application, in such form as may be prescribed by regulation, shall have been filed with the Commissioners of the District of Columbia requesting that such property be placed on the list of property entitled to exemption."

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I do not quite understand what the clerk has been calling. There is nothing now on the calendar.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk is calling the bills which were passed over, and which reverted to the end of the calendar.

Mr. TAFT. I understand.

TRANSFER OF THE REMOUNT SERVICE

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will state the next bill which has been passed over and which has reverted to the end of the calendar.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (H. R. 3484) to transfer the Remount Service from the War Department to the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, in respect to the bill just called by title, I have made an investigation. I find that the junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] is not now on the floor of the Senate or in the city, and cannot be here today. Of course, in view of that fact, I shall not make the motion I have intended to make; but for a moment I should like to state to the Senate the issues involved.

Heretofore the War Department has maintained four remount stations in the United States—one located in Virginia, one located in Nebraska, one located in California, and one located in Oklahoma. A bill was introduced to transfer those four remount stations to the Department of Agriculture. The bill passed the House, and came to the Senate, where it was referred—and properly so, I think—to the Committee on Armed Services. But in my opinion, thereafter the bill should have been referred to the Committee on Agriculture, for I regard this bill as one which should properly have been considered by two committees—in this case the Committee on Armed Services and also the Committee on Agriculture. The bill provides that the War Department shall relinquish its control of the stations, and that they shall be turned over to the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. President, in my opinion the Committee on Armed Services acted properly in the first instance; but when it recommended that the War Department should cease its operation of these remount stations, then I construe that action to end the responsibility and authority of the Committee on Armed Services in the matter. I am not criticizing that committee because it saw fit to recommend that the four remount stations be turned over to the Department of Agriculture, with authority and directive to carry on the work of the Remount Service.

Mr. President, I have no desire to interfere with the operation of the Remount Service in the State of Virginia.

I have been to the station at Front Royal, and I think the land there is adapted to the Remount Service. If the Senators from Virginia want to have the Front Royal remount station continued as a remount station, I shall gladly accede to their request and shall be favorable to that program.

If the Senators from the State of Nebraska want the remount station in Nebraska maintained there, I shall not have objection. In the same way, if the Senators from California want to have the remount station presently in California maintained there, I shall have no objection.

But as to the remount station in my own State, I do have objection. I refer to the Fort Reno remount station, which is located on a tract embracing some 10,000 acres of some of the finest land in the central section of the United States. Much of the land is bottom land. It is now covered with alfalfa.

Mr. President, in Oklahoma we do not use horses very much any more. Oklahoma has mechanized its agricultural industry. Today we use tractors, trucks, and other mechanical devices in our agricultural industry, and we do not need horses there any more.

This bill proposes to continue these remount stations for the purpose of the propagation and production of riding horses—for example, polo ponies and show horses. That is all right for other States if they want it, but we do not want it in our State. So far as I can determine, the people of Oklahoma want this land made available for subdivision and use under the provisions of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act.

That is the whole story; and as soon as I can obtain recognition from the Chair at a time when the Senator from Oregon is present in the Chamber, I shall ask that the bill be taken up.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over under continuing objection.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I yield.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. If the Senator's only desire is to have the Oklahoma remount station excepted from the bill, why could he not attain that objective by an amendment from the floor, instead of having the bill sent back to his committee?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, that would suit me, but I am not sure how the Senators from Nebraska want their land treated. I have discussed the matter with one of the Senators. The remount station in Nebraska occupies a large tract; but I am not familiar with that, and am not sure what should be done with it. The same thing is true of the California station. I do not know what should be done in California.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. Was not this bill reported by the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. No, it was not, and that is my complaint. On the House side, if I may take another moment, by unanimous consent—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator may proceed.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. On the House side, when the Armed Services Committee considered the bill and decided that the War Department should no longer maintain its remount service, the House committee referred the bill to the Committee on Agriculture and asked the chairman of that committee to consider it. The chairman of the House Committee on Agriculture called his committee together and reconsidered the bill. They agreed to the program of the Armed Services Committee.

I contend that a similar procedure should be followed in the Senate before the bill is considered further. I contend that if the lands are to be under the Department of Agriculture, the bill should be referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, in order that the committee may ascertain whether or not that is the best program.

Furthermore, Mr. President, there are two reports on the bill. The Secretary of Agriculture makes one report, and the Under Secretary makes another. I am not sure which one of the reports might be acceptable to our committee because of various angles in connection with the bill. It is of importance to my State, and I am hopeful that at the proper time it may be referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry for further consideration and report. I may say to my friend, the Senator from Virginia, that I am for his program, so far as I am concerned.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. Recognizing the power of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and of the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma, I feel that, unless we have some understanding as to what is to be done about the matter when it gets back to his committee, I shall not see it again when it comes from the committee. I want to be present when it is again considered.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under objection, the bill remains on the calendar.

AUTHORIZATION TO WYANDOTTE TRIBE OF OKLAHOMA TO SELL CEMETERY

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will state the next bill which has been put over to the end of the calendar.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (S. 1372) authorizing the Wyandotte Tribe of Oklahoma to sell tribal cemetery.

Mr. REED. Let the bill go over.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, as to this bill, objection has been made in behalf of the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CAPPER], and I understand that the Senator from Kansas still objects to consideration of the bill.

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I do object. No one in Kansas City wants the proposed legislation.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Let the bill go over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Objection is heard. The bill will be passed over.

Mr. BUTLER subsequently said: Mr. President, I move that the bill (S. 1372), which is No. 565 on the calendar, and to which the Senator from Kansas objected, be recommitted to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs for further consideration.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the order is made.

FOOT-AND-MOUTH-DISEASE RESEARCH

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will state the next bill which has been placed at the foot of the calendar.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (S. 2038) to enable the Secretary of Agriculture to conduct research on foot-and-mouth disease and other diseases of animals and to amend the act of May 29, 1884 (23 Stat. 31), as amended, by adding another section.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I want to ask the Senator from Minnesota if he would be willing to accept an amendment, which I understand is roughly comparable to the one offered in the House of Representatives, and which has been put in the bill in the House, although I think it is more restrictive than mine would be. Would the Senator accept an amendment, on page 1, line 6, after the word "laboratories", to insert "on an island or other isolated area adequate to guard against the accidental spread of the virus." In other words, the Department of Agriculture of California and I think some of the other agricultural departments are very much concerned lest the virus spread from an experimental laboratory. As I read the bill now, a research laboratory could be located in the middle of a dairy county, if the Department of Agriculture should so desire. I should like some restriction to show that this body in giving its approval does so with the understanding that proper safeguards will be taken against the spread of the virus. I understand that in the House bill the limitation is that the work shall be done on an offshore island. My proposal gives a little more latitude, and I suppose it is something that should then be worked out in conference.

Mr. THYE. The junior Senator from Minnesota has no objection to such a provision. However, I should say that the expression "isolated area" does not in any sense exclude a peninsula of the continent.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I would think that if properly safeguarded that would come within the meaning of an isolated area.

Mr. THYE. The only reason the bill was so written was that we had assurance from the Bureau of Animal Industry of the Department of Agriculture that they would consider the seriousness of the virus and would confine the work to an area where it would not in any sense jeopardize the animal industry.

Mr. KNOWLAND. The only difficulty the junior Senator from California sees is that, as frequently happens in connection with acts of Congress, if the law is not perfectly plain, it may be interpreted by some future Department of Agriculture in a manner different from the present understanding. I should feel better if the law were made clear on that point.

Mr. THYE. I should not object.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I desire to offer such an amendment.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2038), which had been reported from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, with an amendment, on page 2, line 8, to strike out "Act: *Provided*, That the number so employed shall not exceed five and that the maximum compensation for each shall not exceed \$15,000 per annum" and to insert "Act. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as Congress may deem necessary; in addition, the Secretary is authorized to utilize, in carrying out this section, funds otherwise available for the control or eradication of such diseases", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the act of May 29, 1834 (23 Stat. 31), as amended, is hereby amended by adding thereto section 12.

"SEC. 12. The Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to establish research laboratories, including the acquisition of necessary land, buildings, or facilities, and also the making of research contracts under the authority contained in section 10 (a) of the Bankhead-Jones Act of 1935 as amended by the Research and Marketing Act of 1946, for research and study, in the United States or elsewhere, of foot-and-mouth disease and other animal diseases which, in the opinion of the Secretary, constitute a threat to the livestock industry of the United States. To carry out the provisions of this section, the Secretary is authorized to employ technical experts or scientists without regard to the Classification Act. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as Congress may deem necessary; in addition, the Secretary is authorized to utilize, in carrying out this section, funds otherwise available for the control or eradication of such diseases."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I now submit the amendment to which I previously referred.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment submitted by the Senator from California, which will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 1, line 6, after the word "laboratories", it is proposed to insert "on an island or other isolated area adequate to guard against the accidental spread of the virus."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

RETIREMENT OF REGULAR ARMY AND AIR FORCE OFFICERS

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, having conferred with the senior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], I ask unanimous consent to return at this time to the consideration of Senate bill 2123, Calendar 933.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will state the bill by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (S. 2123) to exempt certain officers of the Regular Army and Regular Air Force from the provisions of statutes requiring retirement by reason of age, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, this bill refers only to those officers in the Army, Navy, and Air Force who had five-star rank. Five-star rank cannot now be reached because of the bill passed last year, which fixes four-star rank as the maximum. The bill relates to what may be considered to be a mark of honor, extending it to generals of the Air Force and ground forces the same as it is now extended to five-star men of the Navy, such as Admirals Nimitz, Leahy, King, and Halsey. It allows these officers in the Army and Air Force to retire on an active-duty status. It does not cost an additional dollar. It merely makes them available to return to the service for advice and consultation whenever the Army and Air Force want them.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the laws requiring retirement of Regular Army and Regular Air Force officers because of age shall not apply to officers of the Regular Army or Regular Air Force appointed in the grade of General of the Army pursuant to the act of March 23, 1946 (60 Stat. 59). The President may, in his discretion, upon the request of the officer concerned, restore to the active list of the Regular Army or Regular Air Force any officer of the Regular Army or Regular Air Force on the retired list who was appointed in the grade of General of the Army pursuant to the act of March 23, 1946 (60 Stat. 59).

Sec. 2. Officers appointed in the grade of General of the Army pursuant to the act of March 23, 1946 (60 Stat. 59), shall not be counted within the limited number of officers authorized to be serving on active duty in grades above lieutenant general as provided in section 504 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947 (Public Law 381, Eightieth Congress) unless they be serving as Chief of Staff or in command of any territorial or tactical subdivision of the Army or the Air Force.

RESOLUTION RECOMMENDED

Mr. McGRATH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have Calendar 598, Senate Resolution 144, authorizing an investigation of law enforcement and police administration in the District of Columbia, recommitted to the Senate Committee on the District of Columbia, with a recommendation for indefinite postponement.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the order is made.

ALLOCATION AND CONTROL OF GRAIN FOR DISTILLING PURPOSES

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, as I understand the parliamentary situation, the calendar having been completed on bills to which no objection has been made, we are now back on the unfinished business, which is the St. Lawrence seaway.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator is correct.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate temporarily lay aside the unfinished business and proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 942, Senate Joint Resolution 186, relative to the allocation of grain.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I object.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Objection is heard.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I now move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate Joint Resolution 186, Calendar No. 942.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hawkes	Moore
Baldwin	Hayden	Murray
Barkley	Hickenlooper	Myers
Brewster	Hill	O'Connor
Bricker	Hoey	O'Daniel
Bridges	Holland	O'Mahoney
Brooks	Ives	Overton
Buck	Jenner	Pepper
Bushfield	Johnson, Colo.	Reed
Butler	Johnston, S. C.	Revercomb
Byrd	Kem	Robertson, Va.
Cain	Kilgore	Russell
Capehart	Knowland	Saltonstall
Capper	Langer	Sparkman
Chavez	Lodge	Stennis
Connally	Lucas	Stewart
Cooper	McCarran	Taft
Cordon	McCarthy	Thomas, Okla.
Donnell	McClellan	Thomas, Utah
Downey	McFarland	Thye
Dworshak	McGrath	Tobey
Eaton	McKellar	Vandenberg
Ferguson	McMahon	Watkins
Flanders	Magnuson	Wiley
Fulbright	Malone	Williams
George	Martin	Wilson
Green	Maybank	Young
Gurney	Millikin	

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LODGE in the chair). Eight-three Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from California that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate Joint Resolution 186.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, parliamentary inquiry. Would the adoption of the motion displace the unfinished business, that is, the St. Lawrence seaway joint resolution?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is advised that it would displace the St. Lawrence seaway joint resolution until 12 o'clock Friday.

Mr. BARKLEY. That raises a very important parliamentary question whether, notwithstanding the agreement to vote Friday, the joint resolution can be brought back under consideration except by another motion. If it cannot be brought before the Senate except by another motion, a very serious question is raised, namely, whether there will be anything to vote on Friday, because if a measure which is under consideration is displaced, it seems to me that that would displace everything that had happened in regard to it.

I do not care to have the Senate get into a technical situation in which we might find ourselves on Friday without anything to consider because the measure which was the unfinished business had been displaced by a motion to take up another measure. The Senate has been proceeding by unanimous consent in the consideration of other measures. I do not know whether the Senator from California is proceeding on the theory that unanimous consent in this instance cannot be obtained.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, the junior Senator from California has asked unanimous consent to proceed along the line the able Senator is now suggesting. Objection was raised. It was not until objection was raised that the junior Senator from California made the motion which is now pending.

Mr. BARKLEY. I was called from the Chamber at the moment the request was made. That does not alter the parliamentary situation, that if the pending motion should prevail, the unfinished business would be displaced.

I realize that in an informal ruling a few days ago the Chair held that inasmuch as the Senate had agreed upon a time when it would vote, on a day in the future, automatically that order would be carried out although the measure to which the agreement related was displaced and was no longer before the Senate. If it is displaced, it cannot regain its place except on motion, and if no motion were made and carried to resume the consideration of the measure, in my judgment we might find ourselves on Friday without anything on which to vote.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. TAFT. If the motion shall be agreed to, then will not the unanimous-consent agreement restore the St. Lawrence seaway joint resolution at 12 o'clock Friday as the unfinished business before the Senate?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is the opinion of the Chair that, in the light of many precedents, the Senate would revert automatically at 12 o'clock on Friday to the consideration of the St. Lawrence seaway measure, but if it were desired to revert to that measure before that time, a motion would be necessary.

Mr. BARKLEY. No Senator can offer an amendment to the St. Lawrence seaway joint resolution, because the time has passed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time for offering amendments has passed.

Mr. BARKLEY. Of course, any Senator could make a speech on the joint resolution tomorrow, whether it was the unfinished business or had been displaced, as he can make a speech on any subject.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. No question of germaneness is involved in debate.

Mr. BARKLEY. It would be more or less informal, because the joint resolution, in a parliamentary sense, would not be before the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from California.

THE PARTITION OF PALESTINE

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I do not wish to delay a vote on the pending question, but I do wish to make a few comments on another subject.

The Evening Star of today carries this caption:

Partition delay indicated in United Nations Palestine debate; even repeal of plan appears possible; Assembly call asked.

This is an Associated Press dispatch from Lake Success dated February 25:

Delay in partitioning Palestine and perhaps even repeal of the whole scheme appeared possible today in the light of Security Council developments.

Colombia asked the United Nations to consider a special session of the General Assembly to reconsider the split-up plan. The United States asked for a Big Five committee of study and conciliation.

Mr. President, I wish to say just a word or two. I believe I share the sentiment of millions of people in this country, and I hope of the Congress, when I say that it is my earnest hope that our Government and the United Nations are not at this late hour going to renege on the declaration previously made that they were going through with the policy of allowing the partition of Palestine. This was a great test for the United Nations Organization, and I had the feeling that the United Nations courageously met the test. It heard the case from Arab and Jew. It deliberated, and finally arrived at a decision. It may be that the territory that was marked out as the area that should become the Jewish state was not the area which everyone would have preferred, or perhaps the territory which should have been chosen, but it was an honestly made decision, and I think there was a feeling of satisfaction all over this country and in many other parts of the world that at long last we were about to have an international and righteous solution of the age-old problem of the wandering Jew, by allowing his weary footsteps to come to rest again upon his old home soil.

Mr. President, the British Government made a forthright declaration that it intended to withdraw its troops from Palestine. Then the question arose as to how the implementation of the partition policy should be carried out. What happened then? The Arabs set out to intimidate the United Nations Organization. There was set afoot an Arab conspiracy to defeat by force the decision arrived at by the United Nations Organization. Then we had the spectacle of troops moving from one country to another, well armed, well disciplined, well organized, and well led, with an announcement to the world by the Arab leaders that they were going to invade this territory, that they were not going to permit the decision solemnly made by the United Nations Organization to be put into effect.

Mr. President, only 2 days ago I saw in a newspaper pictures of Arabs in the Arab section of Jerusalem looking at a store filled with arms, guns, ammunition, hand grenades, there on display ready to be bought by any Arab who might come in to purchase them. The Arabs have plenty of arms, much of which may be coming from Great Britain by its own admission, but the Jews, to whom have been awarded by the United Nations Organization this territory, are denied by our own embargo the right to buy arms.

Mr. President, the question, of course, may eventually have to be decided whether the United States will send troops—of course, as a part of a United Nations force—to partition or to preserve

the peace in Palestine. I hope that necessity will not arise. I think it is probably correct that it would be only the Congress that could make that decision. I hope Congress shall not be called upon to decide that question, although I do believe that we ought to stand behind the decisions of the United Nations, and see that they are carried out.

But, Mr. President, if we will give the Jews, who have at long last received the prospective satisfaction of the return of their ancient land, the weapons with which to defend themselves, and to defend the United Nations' decision, I believe it will not be necessary to call on the United States Government, or perhaps any other member of the United Nations Organization, to send an international police force to Palestine.

I notice from the newspapers that our able ambassador and delegate to the United Nations has stated that we would consult about the removal of our embargo policy if requested to do so by the United Nations. It is my humble opinion that the United Nations should call upon every member of that organization and see that they are not only authorized but requested, in furtherance of the United Nations decision, to allow the purchase of arms for self-defense by the Jewish people in that part of Palestine which the United Nations has said of right belongs to them.

Mr. President, if we do that—and do it before it is too late—before the Arab has already won the victory with the arms which he has been able to buy in many markets—at least many markets in Europe and in the broad middle eastern area—I believe that the question of subsequently having to send an international force there might not have to be answered, either by the Congress or the country.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I should like to suggest to the Senator from Florida that even far beyond the question of the arms embargo in the present situation, there exists a great parallel between what is now taking place and the attempt, after World War I, to form and hold together and make effective the now defunct League of Nations, in which we did not participate. There is a strong parallel between what then took place and the immediate problem before us of enforcing the decision of the United Nations or inducing the world to accept its decision. What we now see happening is similar to what happened in Manchukuo and in Abyssinia, which broke up the League of Nations and step by step led to World War II. In my opinion, this is the first test of world peace.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, the able Senator from Washington is, in my opinion, absolutely correct. If a decision of the United Nations can be repudiated by force, by the threat of arms, by an actual invasion, then, Mr. President, what sanctity will the decision of the United Nations have?

I want to make one point clear, so far as I am personally concerned. There have been many times in the past when

80TH CONGRESS
2D SESSION

S. 2038

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

FEBRUARY 26, 1948

Referred to the Committee on Agriculture

AN ACT

To enable the Secretary of Agriculture to conduct research on foot-and-mouth disease and other diseases of animals and to amend the Act of May 29, 1884 (23 Stat. 31), as amended, by adding another section.

1 *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representa-*
2 *tives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*
3 That the Act of May 29, 1884 (23 Stat. 31), as amended,
4 is hereby amended by adding thereto section 12.

5 "SEC. 12. The Secretary of Agriculture is authorized
6 to establish research laboratories on an island or other iso-
7 lated area adequate to guard against the accidental spread
8 of the virus, including the acquisition of necessary land,
9 buildings, or facilities, and also the making of research

1 contracts under the authority contained in section 10 (a)
2 of the Bankhead-Jones Act of 1935 as amended by the
3 Research and Marketing Act of 1946, for research and
4 study, in the United States or elsewhere, of foot-and-mouth
5 disease and other animal diseases which, in the opinion of
6 the Secretary, constitute a threat to the livestock industry
7 of the United States. To carry out the provisions of this
8 section, the Secretary is authorized to employ technical ex-
9 perts or scientists without regard to the Classification Act.
10 There is hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums
11 as Congress may deem necessary; in addition, the Secretary
12 is authorized to utilize, in carrying out this section, funds
13 otherwise available for the control or eradication of such
14 diseases."

Passed the Senate February 25 (legislative day, February 2), 1948.

Attest:

CARL A. LOEFFLER,

Secretary.

AN ACT

To enable the Secretary of Agriculture to conduct research on foot-and-mouth disease and other diseases of animals and to amend the Act of May 29, 1884 (23 Stat. 31), as amended, by adding another section.

FEBRUARY 26, 1948

Referred to the Committee on Agriculture

AUTHORIZING RESEARCH ON FOOT-AND-MOUTH DISEASE

FEBRUARY 26, 1948.—Committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed

Mr. HOPE, from the Committee on Agriculture, submitted the following

REPORT

[To accompany H. R. 5098]

The Committee on Agriculture, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 5098) to enable the Secretary of Agriculture to conduct research on foot-and-mouth disease and other diseases of animals and to amend the act of May 29, 1884 (23 Stat. 31), as amended, by adding another section, having considered the same, report thereon with a recommendation that it do pass with the following amendment:

On page 2, line 6, after the words "United States", strike out the period and insert in lieu thereof the following:

, *Provided*, That no live virus of foot-and-mouth disease may be introduced for any purpose into any part of the mainland of the United States except coastal islands separated therefrom by waters navigable for deep water navigation, and except further, that in the event of outbreak of foot-and-mouth disease in this country, the Secretary of Agriculture may, at his discretion, permit said virus to be brought into the United States under adequate safeguards.

STATEMENT

Foot-and-mouth disease is one of the most infectious and destructive livestock diseases known. It affects cattle, hogs, goats, deer, and other cloven-hoofed animals. The establishment of the disease in the United States would wreak almost incalculable damage to the livestock industry. The disruption of the normal interstate commerce in livestock products because of quarantines and other restrictions which would inevitably be necessary, would be certain to result in scarcities and maldistribution of such products which would mean higher prices and perhaps even hardship for city consumers of meat, milk, and other livestock products.

Until it became apparent last November that efforts to eradicate the outbreak of foot-and-mouth disease in Mexico by slaughter and

burial could not succeed, there was the hope that strict quarantine and other sanitary measures, together with vigorous eradication of such outbreaks as might occur, would keep the disease out of the United States. When it was seen, however, that it would be impossible to eradicate the Mexican outbreak, it became certain that the disease would be present on the North American continent for many years and the United States was faced with the ever-present danger that the disease may spread into this country at any time.

The Department of Agriculture's reassessment of the situation of this country and its views on the necessity for undertaking research on foot-and-mouth disease in the United States is set out in the following excerpt of a letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, dated February 6, 1948, to Hon. Arthur Capper, chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry of the United States Senate, requesting the approval of a similar bill (S. 2038) introduced in the Senate by Senator Thyre:

Foot-and-mouth disease has occurred in the United States six times within the past 50 years. Each time it has been eradicated by prompt and drastic action by Federal and State livestock disease control officials at considerable cost of money expended and livestock destroyed. More frequent outbreaks have been prevented by the application of strict controls exercised over the importation of susceptible animals, the products of such animals, and other substances such as hay, straw, and the like, which might carry the virus of the disease. The last outbreak occurred in the United States in 1929.

As a further protection to the livestock of the United States the other countries of North America also have been free of foot-and-mouth disease until late in 1946 when the disease was diagnosed in Mexico. Since that time foot-and-mouth disease has spread over the central one-third of Mexico and is now endemic in that area. Large-scale cooperative efforts by the Governments of Mexico and the United States have been successful thus far to contain the disease within the central part of Mexico but have not been successful to stamp it out. Accordingly, we now have within 300 miles of our border a large area infected with foot-and-mouth disease from which the disease may escape and reach into the United States.

Research on foot-and-mouth disease has never been conducted in the United States because it was felt that the remoteness of the danger and the effectiveness of the control and eradication measures made it not worth while to assume the risks of experimenting with the disease in this country. Now that danger is no longer remote. It is close by. We are faced with the possibility of having to combat the disease regularly rather than at infrequent intervals. If the disease should come into the United States, the same eradication measures that have been used in the past would be energetically applied. However, it is also recognized that there is much that can be learned about this disease through research. The extent of the knowledge that can be thus gained can only be estimated at this time. It is quite possible that such knowledge will be of priceless value to this country in fighting the disease in the future. Although much research has been done in other countries and a great deal of information accumulated about the disease, we do not think it is sufficient to continue to rely upon the research of others. This country must throw its skills and researches into the endeavor to finally conquer foot-and-mouth disease.

Department scientists have in the past worked on this problem in the laboratories in other countries. However, since 1926, this has not been on a large scale. Under the proposal in S. 2038, it would be our plan to establish in the United States at suitable location a modern research institute where full study of all phases of the disease could be undertaken. The most suitable location would be on a peninsula, from which traffic of the mainland could be carefully guarded. Taking full advantage of the experiences of others in protecting their research laboratories against the accidental escape of the virus, the institute to be established here would be equipped with every safeguard to give the livestock industry of this country an assurance that the virus would have no reasonable chance for escape. Preliminary plans for the laboratory have been sketched out and are being perfected.

In recruiting scientific personnel for the laboratory, it is essential, we think, that extreme care be exercised and employment given only to those who, in addition to having the requisite education and training, are also inclined toward research in their particular field. Likewise, selection should be made of those persons, otherwise qualified, who do not have family obligations which would mitigate against ready and continued acceptance of the restrictions of service in such a laboratory. As stated above, the laboratory would be operated with every possible safeguard against the escape of the virus, including very stringent sanitary measures, and absolute adherence to the safety provisions will be made a condition of employment. It is essential, therefore, that we be in position to terminate forthwith the appointment of any employee at the time of the first infringement of any of the established safeguards.

In order to accomplish these matters, it is suggested that S. 2038 be amended by deleting the sentence beginning on line 5, page 2, and substituting in place thereof the following:

"To carry out the provisions of this section the Secretary is authorized to make appointments without regard to the civil-service laws or regulations, and, when in his opinion the protection of the livestock industry in the United States so requires, to terminate such appointments without regard to the provisions of law relating to the removal of Federal employees. The Secretary is further authorized in carrying out such provisions to employ technical experts or scientists without regard to the Classification Act of 1923, as amended: *Provided*, That the number so employed shall not exceed five and that the maximum compensation for each shall not exceed \$15,000 per annum."

This Department recommends that the bill, amended as above, be passed. A similar bill, H. R. 5098, has been introduced in the House by the Honorable George W. Gillie, of Indiana. Department representatives appeared before the Subcommittee on Foot-and-Mouth Disease of the House Committee on Agriculture in favor of this latter bill at hearings held on January 26 and 27.

Hearings were held January 26 and 27, and February 3 and 4, by a subcommittee headed by Mr. Gillie, of Indiana. At these hearings representatives of the Bureau of Animal Industry strongly urged approval of the bill and presented convincing argument why a research laboratory in Mexico or some other foreign country, or on an isolated island, would be unsatisfactory.

The amendment made by the committee will permit construction and operation of a research laboratory in a place where it will be completely under the control and jurisdiction of the United States, such as a coastal island, and yet will prohibit bringing the highly-infectious live virus onto the mainland unless and until there should be an outbreak of the disease here.

CHANGES IN EXISTING LAW

In compliance with paragraph 2a of rule XIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, new matter added by the reported bill is shown in italics:

ACT OF MAY 29, 1884

AN ACT For the establishment of a Bureau of Animal Industry, to prevent the exportation of diseased cattle and to provide means for the suppression and extirpation of pleuropneumonia and other contagious diseases among domestic animals

SEC. 12. *The Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to establish research laboratories, including the acquisition of necessary land, buildings, or facilities, and also the making of research contracts under the authority contained in section 10 (a) of the Bankhead-Jones Act of 1935, as amended by the Research and Marketing Act of 1946, for research and study, in the United States or elsewhere, of foot-and-mouth disease and other animal diseases which in the opinion of the Secretary constitute a threat to the livestock industry of the United States: Provided, That no live virus of foot-and-mouth disease may be introduced for any purpose into any part of the mainland of the United States except coastal islands separated therefrom by waters navigable for deep-water navigation, and except further, that in the event of outbreak of foot-and-*

mouth disease in this country, the Secretary of Agriculture may, at his discretion, permit said virus to be brought into the United States under adequate safeguards. To carry out the provisions of this section, the Secretary is authorized to employ technical experts or scientists without regard to the Classification Act: Provided, That the number so employed shall not exceed five and that the maximum compensation for each shall not exceed \$15,000 per annum. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as Congress may deem necessary, in addition, the Secretary is authorized to utilize, in carrying out this section, funds otherwise available for the control or eradication of such diseases."



Union Calendar No. 683

80TH CONGRESS
2D SESSION

H. R. 5098

[Report No. 1425]

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

JANUARY 22, 1948

Mr. GILLIE introduced the following bill; which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture

FEBRUARY 26, 1948

Reported with an amendment, committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, and ordered to be printed

[Insert the part printed in italic]

A BILL

To enable the Secretary of Agriculture to conduct research on foot-and-mouth disease and other diseases of animals and to amend the Act of May 29, 1884 (23 Stat. 31), as amended, by adding another section.

1 *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representa-*
2 *tives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*
3 That the Act of May 29, 1884 (23 Stat. 31), as amended,
4 is hereby amended by adding a new section 12 reading as
5 follows:

6 “SEC. 12. The Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to
7 establish research laboratories, including the acquisition of
8 necessary land, buildings, or facilities, and also the making

1 of research contracts under the authority contained in section
2 10 (a) of the Bankhead-Jones Act of 1935, as amended by
3 the Research and Marketing Act of 1946, for research and
4 study, in the United States or elsewhere, of foot-and-mouth
5 disease and other animal diseases which in the opinion of the
6 Secretary constitute a threat to the livestock industry of the
7 United States: *Provided, That no live virus of foot-and-*
8 *mouth disease may be introduced for any purpose into any*
9 *part of the mainland of the United States except coastal*
10 *islands separated therefrom by waters navigable for deep-*
11 *water navigation, and except further, that in the event of*
12 *outbreak of foot-and-mouth disease in this country, the*
13 *Secretary of Agriculture may, at his discretion, permit said*
14 *virus to be brought into the United States under adequate*
15 *safeguards.* To carry out the provisions of this section, the
16 Secretary is authorized to employ technical experts or scien-
17 tists without regard to the Classification Act: *Provided,*
18 *That the number so employed shall not exceed five and that*
19 *the maximum compensation for each shall not exceed*
20 *\$15,000 per annum.* There is hereby authorized to be ap-
21 propriated such sums as Congress may deem necessary; in
22 addition, the Secretary is authorized to utilize, in carrying
23 out this section, funds otherwise available for the control or
24 eradication of such diseases.”

80TH CONGRESS
2D Session

H. R. 5098

[Report No. 1425]

A BILL

To enable the Secretary of Agriculture to conduct research on foot-and-mouth disease and other diseases of animals and to amend the Act of May 29, 1884 (23 Stat. 31), as amended, by adding another section.

By Mr. GILLIE

JANUARY 22, 1948

Referred to the Committee on Agriculture

FEBRUARY 26, 1948

Reported with an amendment, committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, and ordered to be printed

CONGRESSIONAL PROCEEDINGS

OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND FINANCE
 Division of Legislative Reports
 (For Department staff only)

Issued March 4, 1948
 For actions of March 3, 1948
 80th-2nd, No. 40

Do you receive this Digest promptly? If you are located in the USDA buildings in D. C., you should ordinarily receive the Digest before noon on the day of issuance. If the bulletin is delayed in reaching you, please call Ext. 4654 and we'll be glad to help locate the delay in distribution.

CONTENTS

Appropriations.....10,26,28	Grain.....5	Research
Assistant Secretaries...14	Health.....16	Animal industry.....8
Dairy industry.....10	Housing.....13	School-lunch program.....22
Economy.....6	Lands.....17	Sec. 32 funds.....3,19
Electrification.....21	Lands, reclamation.....12	Soil conservation.....19
Federal aid.....16	Livestock and meat.....8	Surplus commodities.....3
Fertilizers.....19	Marketing.....15	Taxation.....9,10
Foreign affairs	Oleomargarine.....9,10	Trade, foreign.....7,11,23
Relief.....1,3,5,11,25,27	Personnel.....2	Transportation.....24
Forests and forestry.....4	Poultry.....20	Water, conservation.....18

HIGHLIGHTS: Senate debated ERP bill. Both Houses received President's recommendation for revision of Classification Act. Senate committee approved bill for use of Sec. 32 funds in connection with foreign aid. Sen. Young's bill to repeal wheat-carryover requirement transferred to Agriculture Committee. Rep. Hope introduced bills to provide 2 additional Assistant Secretaries of Agriculture and to amend marketing-agreements law. Rep. Murray (Wis.) spoke in favor of Dirksen fertilizer bill and inserted table showing use of Sec. 32 funds. House Rules Committee cleared foot-and-mouth disease research bill. During debate on State-Justice-Commerce bill, Rep. Mitchell urged oleo-tax repeal. Rep. Foote recommended oleo-tax repeal.

SENATE

1. EUROPEAN RECOVERY PROGRAM. Continued debate on S. 2202, the ERP bill (pp. 2089-118).
2. CLASSIFICATION-ACT REVISION. Both Houses received the President's message transmitting the annual report of the Civil Service Commission, urging enactment of the recommendations contained therein, and commending the work of Government employees. To Post Office and Civil Service Committees. (pp. 2085, 2132-3.) The "Daily Digest" states that the report "recommended a revision of the Classification Act of 1923, providing for establishment of compensation schedules by grades only instead of by both services and grades; to place responsibility on the Commission for development of standards under which jobs are to be classified, such job classification to be subject to post-audit by the Commission; and to clearly set forth the factors which are to be taken into consideration in classifying jobs." (H. Doc. 455.)
3. SURPLUS COMMODITIES. The Agriculture and Forestry Committee approved, but did not actually report, S. J. Res. 187, which provides that, to encourage exportation of surplus commodities for foreign aid, the Department may make payments from Sec. 32 funds, including payments to any Government agency procuring or

selling such commodities or products, in an amount not over 50 percent of the sales prices; and cancels the rescission of Sec. 32 funds by Public Law 266, 80th Cong. (p. D189).

4. FORESTS. The Agriculture and Forestry Committee approved, but did not actually report, S. 1090, to safeguard and consolidate certain areas within the Superior National Forest, with amendment (p. D189).
5. WHEAT CARRYOVER. At Sen. Young's request, his bill (S. 2158) to repeal the wheat carryover requirement, was transferred from the Foreign Relations Committee to the Agriculture and Forestry Committee (p. 2087). In view of this action, Sen. Young said he would not propose a similar amendment in connection with the ERP bill.
6. EMPLOYMENT ACT OF 1946. Sen. Murray, Mont., commended this Act and reviewed its accomplishments (pp. 2094-5).
7. TRADE AGREEMENTS. Sen. Butler, Nebr., inserted various statements criticizing administration of the Trade Agreements Act (pp. 2118-22).

HOUSE

8. FOOT-AND-MOUTH DISEASE. The Rules Committee reported a resolution for the consideration of H. R. 5098, to enable this Department to conduct research on foot-and-mouth and other diseases of animals (pp. 2127, 2165). The resolution limits general debate to 1 hour and provides for the bill to be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule.
9. OLEOMARGARINE TAXES. Rep. Foote, Conn., spoke in favor of repeal of oleomargarine taxes (p. 2130).
10. STATE, JUSTICE, COMMERCE, AND JUDICIARY APPROPRIATION BILL, 1949. Began debate on this bill, H.R. 5607 (pp. 2133-63). During the debate Rep. Mitchell, Ind., spoke in favor of repeal of oleomargarine taxes, stating that "Federal antimargarine laws are wrong in principle" and stating that the repeal of such taxes would not injure the butter industry (pp. 2161-3).
11. FOREIGN AID. Received from the State Department a draft of a proposed bill to amend the Foreign Aid Act of 1947 in order to provide for assistance to the Free Territory of Trieste. To Foreign Affairs Committee. (p. 2165.)
Received a Vienna and Mount Vernon (Maine) citizens' petition urging that shipments of food and certain machinery to Russia be stopped (p. 2166).
12. RECLAMATION. The Public Lands Committee reported without amendment S. 1990, to provide for continuation and completion of the Deer Creek and aqueduct division of the Provo River project, Utah (H.Rept. 1492) (p. 2165).
13. HOUSING. Received Mass. Legislature memorials urging enactment of the Taft-Hendler-Wagner housing bill (p. 2166).

BILLS INTRODUCED

14. ASSISTANT SECRETARIES. H.R. 5689, by Rep. Hope, Kans., to establish two additional offices of Assistant Secretaries of Agriculture. To Agriculture Committee. (p. 2165.)
15. MARKETING AGREEMENTS AND ORDERS. H.R. 5688, by Rep. Hope, Kans., to amend the

CONSIDERATION OF H. R. 5098

MARCH 3, 1948.—Referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois, from the Committee on Rules, submitted the following

REPORT

[To accompany H. Res. 491]

The Committee on Rules, having had under consideration House Resolution 491, report the same to the House with the recommendation that the resolution do pass.



80TH CONGRESS
2^D SESSION

House Calendar No. 182

H. RES. 491

[Report No. 1484]

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MARCH 3, 1948

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following resolution; which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed

RESOLUTION

1 *Resolved*, That immediately upon the adoption of this
2 resolution it shall be in order to move that the House
3 resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on
4 the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill
5 (H. R. 5098) to enable the Secretary of Agriculture to
6 conduct research on foot-and-mouth disease and other dis-
7 eases of animals and to amend the Act of May 29, 1884
8 (23 Stat. 31), as amended, by adding another section, and
9 all points of order against said bill are hereby waived. That
10 after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and
11 continue not to exceed one hour, to be equally divided and
12 controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member

1 of the Committee on Agriculture, the bill shall be read for
2 amendment under the five-minute rule. At the conclusion
3 of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Com-
4 mittee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such
5 amendments as may have been adopted and the previous
6 question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and
7 amendments thereto to final passage without intervening
8 motion except one motion to recommit.

RESOLUTION

Providing for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 5098) to enable the Secretary of Agriculture to conduct research on foot-and-mouth disease and other diseases of animals and to amend the Act of May 29, 1884 (23 Stat. 31), as amended, by adding another section.

By Mr. ALLEN of Illinois

MARCH 3, 1948

Referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed

As one who has been called upon by the gentleman from Massachusetts, Speaker MARTIN, to preside as Chairman over the Committee on the Whole House on the State of the Union, I know what it means to have close by this able Parliamentarian, whose mental processes are triggerlike and whose memory is amazing. His importance in our legislative system has not been overstated in the tributes of this day and it should be emphasized that he has been the right arm of distinguished Speakers during the most trying days of our Republic.

I love the House, and one of the reasons is Lewis Deschler.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that subcommittees of the Committee on the Judiciary may sit during general debate today.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

FOOT-AND-MOUTH DISEASE

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 491, Rept. No. 1484), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 5098) to enable the Secretary of Agriculture to conduct research on foot-and-mouth disease and other diseases of animals and to amend the act of May 29, 1884 (23 Stat. 31), as amended, by adding another section, and all points of order against said bill are hereby waived. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Agriculture, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

PUBLIC AIRPORT IN THE TERRITORY OF ALASKA

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 492, Rept. No. 1485), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3510) to authorize the construction, protection, operation, and maintenance of a public airport in the Territory of Alaska. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the

consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SABATH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a radio address he made on February 27.

Mr. LANE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in three instances, and to include in one an editorial that appeared in the Lynn Telegram-News, and in each of the other two a resolution from the General Court of Massachusetts.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

JOHN W. McCORMACK FOR VICE PRESIDENT

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, to provide a balanced ticket that will appeal to the big city voters President Truman needs a strong running mate from the East.

The convention of the Democratic Party, which will choose its two standard bearers and draw up the platform on which it will present its case to the Nation, is only 4 months away.

The office of Vice President can no longer be considered as mere window dressing. Twice within our lifetime it has meant that the understudy became principal. In selecting a nominee for Vice President, we should bear in mind that he is but a step away from the Presidency itself. Consequently, he must be thoroughly familiar with the functions of our Federal Government and must be favorably known by the people of the 48 States.

Meeting this bill of particulars is the All-American Congressman, the gentleman from Massachusetts, JOHN W. McCORMACK.

He is no amateur drafted for the honor because he has made a name for himself in some other field.

Nor is he a sectional candidate with some knowledge of State government but untried in the larger and more difficult responsibilities of national and international affairs.

But JOHN McCORMACK definitely is the work horse of the Democratic Party. Through a most strenuous period in our history, including depression, war, and reconstruction, he has carried the ball for the alert and progressive policies of our party.

A capable and trusted adviser to two Presidents, JOHN McCORMACK has led the fight for the administration in this House of Representatives for many years. In company with the gentleman from Texas, SAM RAYBURN, he has provided positive leadership for Congress dur-

ing its most trying years. Consulted on all matters by the White House, he has acquired a broad knowledge of both administrative and legislative problems that enables him to resolve the differences that frequently occur between these two branches of Government. With his legal training and experience, he understands the checks and balances which are the safeguards for our three-way form of government.

Other potential candidates for this position have individual abilities, but in none will you find the all-around, practical, and seasoned knowledge of the workings of Federal Government as that possessed by JOHN McCORMACK.

Even before he was elevated to the high and exacting office of majority leader in the House of Representatives in 1940, he battled untiringly for such legislation as social security, the regulation of the stock market, the conservation of our natural resources, the establishment of great public power projects in the South, West, and Northwest, which government officials from all nations come to study in an attempt to duplicate, and for an agricultural program which has raised our farmers from the bankruptcy of the twenties and the Dust Bowl tragedy of the thirties to the highest level of progress and income they have ever enjoyed.

As our late President Franklin D. Roosevelt often commented: "I like JOHN; he has guts."

Our Nation cannot take a chance with untried leadership. Stupendous problems lie before us. For their solution we need bold and imaginative leaders with the dynamic qualities of a JOHN McCORMACK, who has the faculty of getting things done. This is the mark of a true executive.

If the Democratic Party is not to fail itself and the Nation, it must choose the strongest possible candidates at its July convention. They must be loyal Democrats whose records prove that they consistently believe in government of, by, and for the people, rather than the special interests who want invisible government. They must have the respect and confidence of all segments of our party. They must be well and favorably known to the Nation.

The popular Bostonian is the logical choice of our party for the Vice Presidency because he measures up to each and every requirement.

As a fellow Congressman from Massachusetts, I know of his absolute dedication to the welfare of our country. The high esteem in which he is regarded by the Members of this deliberative body confirms this opinion. He has what it takes to win national support.

After nearly 20 years of outstanding service in the House of Representatives, the time has arrived to honor our Democratic whip. I propose that we start now to work for the nomination and election of JOHN W. McCORMACK as Vice President of these United States.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ROGERS of Florida asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

ANTILYNCHING LEGISLATION

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, I am sure I am divulging no secret when I state that yesterday the House Committee on the Judiciary, of which I am a member, by a majority vote of 18 to 8 reported favorably on H. R. 3488 as introduced by the gentleman from New Jersey, Congressman CASE. These facts have already been carried in the press. I, of course, voted with the minority and shall continue to vigorously oppose all attempts to enact any such legislation. I sincerely trust that if, as, and when this so-called antilynching bill reaches the floor of the House a majority of us will vote against the measure.

No doubt other provisions of the President's so-called civil-rights program will be reaching the floor soon. Surely there is no justification for the enactment of such legislation. These hurtful measures are harmful, not only to our fair southland but to the entire Nation. Instead of being good for the country, the effort by the Federal Government to invade State's rights by the enactment of antilynching, antipoll tax, antisegregation, and the iniquitous FEPC legislation, is sure to result in great harm.

The potential dangers in the enactment of the so-called antilynching measure cannot now be estimated. This antilynching measure, as we all know, is only one phase of the general agitation for racial legislation. My northern friends in both parties have been endeavoring for many years to drive an opening wedge between the people of the South and their constitutional right to conduct their own local affairs without unwarranted interference on the part of the Federal Government.

The proposed Federal antilynching law is based on nothing but political expediency. It is a vote-getting measure pure and simple. In the name of politics, my friends of the Republican Party and many of my friends of the Democratic Party propose to place in the hands of the Federal Government the power to coerce the governors and the public officers of the individual States.

The justification for such a move is so slight as to be ridiculous. Every hearing that has been held on antilynching legislation during the past quarter century has brought out the fact that lynching is rapidly being stamped out. Lynching will soon be, if it is not already, a thing of the past. During the year 1947 there was only one bona fide case of lynching in the United States, and it is a source of deep regret that the incident took place in my own district in my own county of Greenville. But all of you know what happened. The suspects were promptly apprehended, tried, and acquitted. Had there been a Federal statute, and had the trial been held in a Federal court, there

is no doubt that the same verdict would have been returned.

Since the year 1892, when lynchings reached their highest peak, the States on their own initiative have succeeded in virtually eradicating the lynch threat in America. The report of the Tuskegee Institute released early this year is significant. During 1947, the report states, there were 39 incidents that could have degenerated into lynchings. In all but one of these incidents, mob violence was prevented by the bold and resolute action of State and local officials. In other words, the States of the South have effectively protected their citizens from the crime of lynching. May I inquire of my friends in large northern cities if their citizens are equally well protected against equally horrible crimes?

No one deplores lynchings more than I do. No democracy can long endure when mob action supplants due process of law. We in the South detest lynching and mob violence of every type. And we have fought it so successfully that during the year 1947 lynching was the only form of crime that did not show an increase.

I do not say that lynching is at an end in America. I fervently hope it is. But I do say, and I say it with all the confidence and assurance that I have, that we have seen the beginning of the end. Lynching is on its way out. And it is on its way out, not as a result of any Federal legislation, but through the good sense and fixed determination of the several States. Whatever lynching problems the South has had, it has licked those problems. And it will lick its other problems involving questions of race without the necessity for interference by the Federal Government.

The antilynching measure is not only unnecessary but it is manifestly unconstitutional, as eminent lawyers have stated. Implicit in the very concept of our constitutional democracy is the idea that government starts with the individual and works up through the community, the State, and then to the Federal Government. We cannot challenge the power of the States to regulate their internal affairs without challenging the Constitution itself. To reverse the natural succession of authority is to endanger the very foundations on which representative democracy rests.

We have just concluded a long and bitter war to eliminate from the world the threat of authoritative ideas in government. We profess to be conducting a crusade, through the European recovery program, against what still remains of that totalitarian concept. How can we then, with any semblance of consistency, take steps in our own Nation to kick the props from under our own democracy by injecting Federal authority into matters that belong rightfully and constitutionally to the individual States? The people are the government. The people and the Government are resident in our States. If this legislation is enacted here, this body will be party to a lynching far more monstrous than any the act seeks to prevent—for this body, in passing this legislation, will have lynched the Constitution itself.

Consider again the importance of what you are proposing to do. Do you for one moment believe that we of the South are unaware of our racial problems, or do you believe that we do not recognize our responsibility and our capacity to deal with those problems? We are not blind. And those of you who know us at all know that we are not heartless. Do my northern friends think that they have a monopoly on consideration and sympathy for the Negro? On the contrary, sympathy can stem only from understanding, and understanding can result only from experience and association. This problem belongs to the South, and the South will solve it—the South is solving it. All we ask is the chance to complete this work. All we ask is that you take no hasty action which will jeopardize the work that has already been accomplished, the progress we have already achieved.

The South is moving toward a solution of its complex racial problems. It is moving more rapidly than most of us realize. Today, throughout the entire Southland, you will find a great majority of the people in what were formerly termed "lynch areas," who are denouncing this crime, fighting this crime, and stamping it out completely. No, my friends, the South is not the center of reaction that my northern friends seem to imagine. There is a progressive spirit in the South that is moving forward with force and effectiveness to erase the causes of tension and to uplift the living standards of the South. There is precious little real help coming from the outside. All the real work of progress is being accomplished by the South itself, because few people outside the South understand the problems or have sufficient insight to apply practical remedies. In spite of powerful economic forces that discriminate against southern agriculture and industry, in spite of the ill-advised invasion of northern labor agitators, in spite of consistent endeavors of our northern friends to foment malcontent and exaggerate racial tensions—in spite of all these things, the South is on the way up the social and economic scale. It is a bootstrap struggle, but it is a successful struggle.

We of the South have no need to be ashamed—rather, we should be proud—of the great strides our people have made, acting on their own initiative. We have had our isolated lynchings, but at least we have not had any governor to speak his blessings upon and offer his promises of pardon to members of lynch mobs. The public officials of the South are serving well the cause of justice. Mobs will never rule the South. The South will continue to dispense equal justice under law.

There is only one method whereby the barbarism of lynching can be eliminated from the American scene. That is the method of self-regulation, self-restraint. No compulsion from outside in the form of a Federal antilynching statute can ever prevent a single lynching. The only way to deal with mobs is through community responsibility, through the kind of local authority assured to the several States by the United States Constitution.

DIGEST OF
CONGRESSIONAL PROCEEDINGS
OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND FINANCE
Division of Legislative Reports
(For Department staff only)

Issued April 8, 1948
For actions of April 7, 1948
80th-2nd, No. 64

CONTENTS

Appropriations.....	4,12	Foreign affairs	Property, surplus.....	5
Auditing.....	8	Relief.....	Research	
Corporations.....	8	Furs.....	Animal industry.....	10
Dairy industry.....	14,26	Housing.....	Roads.....	13
Education.....	16	Irrigation.....	Soil conservation.....	22
Extension work.....	27	Lands, reclamation.....	Sugar.....	19
Farm program.....	6	Livestock and meat.....	Taxation.....	14,22,26,29
Federal aid.....	13,16	Nematode control.....	Territories & possessions..	20
Flood control.....	17,24	Oleomargarine.....	Tobacco.....	9
Fruits and vegetables..	3,11	Prices, farm.....	Trade, foreign.....	9,23,25

HIGHLIGHTS: Senate confirmed Hoffman nomination. Senate members of joint foreign-aid committee appointed. Senate debated Remount Service bill; Thomas motion to refer bill to Agriculture Committee is pending. Senate committee reported bills to provide for meat inspection at Federal expense and to protect against golden nematode. Senate committee reported Flanders amendments to housing bill. Both Houses received GAO audit report on FCA corporations. House debated foot-and-mouth disease research bill. House tabled resolution requesting information from USDA on producer-consumer price spreads; USDA statement inserted.

SENATE

1. FOREIGN AID. Confirmed the nomination of Paul G. Hoffman to be Administrator for Economic Cooperation (p. 4256).
Sens. Smith, Lodge, Connally, Bridges, and McCarran were appointed Senate members of the Joint Committee on Foreign Economic Cooperation (pp. 4256-7). House members have not yet been appointed.
2. REMOUNT SERVICE. Began debate on H. R. 3484, to transfer the Remount Service (which improves horse breeds) from the Army Department to USDA (pp. 4281-4). Agreed to the committee amendments. Sen. Thomas, Okla., submitted an amendment to transfer part of the Ft. Reno station to the Justice Department for the Southwestern Reformatory, part to USDA for division into farms and sale under the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, and part to the city of El Reno. Without discussing this amendment, he then made a motion that the bill be referred to the Agriculture and Forestry Committee and inserted a resolution of Jan. 7 from that Committee recommending such action. This motion was pending when the Senate recessed.
3. GOLDEN NEMATODE. The Agriculture and Forestry Committee reported without amendment S. 2137, which authorizes USDA to carry out operations against the golden nematode, independently or in cooperation with the State and local agencies involved; and to compensate growers of potatoes and tomatoes in infested areas for losses resulting when they refrain from planting in order to combat the nematode (S. Rept. 1106)(p. 4253).
4. MEAT INSPECTION. The Agriculture and Forestry Committee reported with amendment S. 2256, to provide for meat inspection at Federal expense (S.Rept.1107)(p.4253).

5. SURPLUS PROPERTY. The Interior and Insular Affairs Committee reported with amendment H. R. 3703, to authorize transfer of certain surplus real property to the National Park Service (S. Rept. 1109)(p. 4253).
6. FARM PROGRAM. The Agriculture and Forestry Committee announced that it will begin hearings on S. 2318, the Aiken long-range farm program bill, on Apr. 12, with Secretary Anderson as the witness (p. D334).
7. HOUSING. The "Daily Digest" states as follows regarding the meeting of the Banking and Currency Committee: "In executive session, the committee voted to report favorably the Flanders amendments (these amendments, in effect, propose practically to rewrite the bill) to S. 866, to establish and carry out a national housing policy" (p. D334).
8. FCA AUDIT. Both Houses received the GAO audit report on various FCA corporations for the fiscal year 1946; to Expenditures in the Executive Departments Committee (H. Doc. 598)(pp. 4252-3, 4318).
9. TOBACCO EXPORTS. Sen. Johnston, S. C., criticized British increases in the tobacco tariff (p. 4284).

HOUSE

10. FOOT-AND-MOUTH DISEASE RESEARCH. Began debate on H.R. 5098, to enable USDA to conduct research on foot-and-mouth disease in the U.S. (pp. 4297-308). When further action on the bill was postponed until today, an amendment by Rep. Macy, N.Y., designed to prevent such research on Long Island, N.Y., was pending.
11. FARM PRICES. Laid on the table H. Res. 511, requesting USDA to report the nature and extent of research activities relating to the price spread between the producer and consumer of agricultural products, particularly fruits and vegetables, the possibility of expediting such activities, and the findings and conclusions of such activities (pp. 4292-5). The Agriculture Committee had reported the resolution adversely, after receipt of information from the Department (pp. 4292, 4319). The statement from the Department was inserted in the Record (pp. 4292-5).
12. INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATION BILL, 1949. Received the conference report on this bill, H.R. 5214 (pp. 4296-7). The conferees fixed the Emergency Fund for the President at \$200,000 (Senate, \$100,000; House, \$700,000); fixed the Budget Bureau item at \$2,992,000 (Senate figure; House, \$3,192,000) with the understanding that the \$200,000 reduction shall be applied to divisions other than the Estimates and Fiscal Divisions and those engaged in strictly budgetary work and adopted the House figure of \$300,000 (Senate, \$350,000) for the Council of Economic Advisers.
13. ROADS. The Rules Committee reported a resolution for the consideration of H.R. 5888, to authorize appropriations for continuing highway construction under the Federal-Aid Road Act (pp. 4296, 4319).
14. OLEOMARGARINE. Rep. Rankin, Miss., compared purity of oleomargarine and butter (pp. 4291-2).
Rep. Murray, Wis., criticized the submission of the petition to discharge the committee on the oleomargarine-tax-repeal bill (p. 4288).
15. IRRIGATION. The Public Lands Committee reported with amendments H.R. 5669, to provide adjustments of irrigation charges on the Flathead Indian irrigation

services in the District of Columbia, adjusted to provide \$3,695,500 for such purpose.

Amendments Nos. 9 and 10, relating to the Federal Trade Commission: Appropriates \$3,401,510 for salaries and expenses, instead of \$3,361,510, as proposed by the House, and \$3,521,510, as proposed by the Senate, the increase of \$40,000 above the House bill provides \$10,000 for mail-order insurance regulatory work and \$30,000 for trade-practice conference work, no funds being provided in the conference agreement for administered price studies or program. The conferees have recommended elimination of the words "and investigations necessary thereto" in connection with the provision inserted by the Senate for trade-practice conference work.

Amendments Nos. 11 and 12: Strikes out the provision of the House bill providing for a health-service program in connection with the item for salaries and expenses, public buildings and grounds in the District of Columbia, Public Buildings Administration, and inserts, as proposed by the Senate, a similar item providing that funds available to the Public Buildings Administration may be used for such health-service program.

Amendment No. 13: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 14: Restores the provision of the House authorizing the use of \$100,000 of funds for administrative expenses, Public Roads Administration, for surveys in connection with the Inter-American Highway.

Amendments Nos. 15 and 16: Appropriates \$427,288,854 for Federal-aid postwar highways, as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$452,288,854, as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 17: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 18: Appropriates \$9,131,317 for general expenses, Interstate Commerce Commission, instead of \$9,056,317, as proposed by the House, and \$9,206,317, as proposed by the Senate. Attention of the conferees has been called to embarrassment of petroleum pipe lines in payment of taxes because of valuation work of the Interstate Commerce Commission not being current. The conferees suggest that the Interstate Commerce Commission give all possible attention to this problem.

Amendment No. 19: Appropriates \$400,000, as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$241,000, as proposed by the House, for land acquisition, National Capital and metropolitan area, in connection with funds for the National Capital Park and Planning Commission.

Amendment No. 20: Strikes out the provision of the Senate appropriating \$50,000 for District of Columbia redevelopment.

AMENDMENTS IN DISAGREEMENT

The managers on the part of the House have authorized the following motions with respect to amendments in disagreement:

Amendment No. 1, relating to additional personal services for the White House Office. The managers on the part of the House will move to recede and concur with an amendment.

Amendment No. 13, relating to funds for a Geophysical Institute, Alaska. The managers on the part of the House will move to recede and concur.

Amendment No. 17, relating to funds for a testing and research laboratory, Public Roads Administration. The managers on the part of the House will move to recede and concur.

R. B. WIGGLESWORTH,
JOHN PHILLIPS,
CHAS. R. ROBERTSON,
F. R. COUDERT, JR.,
JOE HENDRICKS,
ALBERT THOMAS,

Managers on the Part of the House.

AUTHORIZING RESEARCH ON FOOT-AND-MOUTH DISEASE

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 491 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 5098) to enable the Secretary of Agriculture to conduct research on foot-and-mouth disease and other diseases of animals and to amend the act of May 29, 1884 (23 Stat. 31), as amended, by adding another section, and all points of order against said bill are hereby waived. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Agriculture, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH], and I yield myself such time as I may need.

Mr. Speaker, the rule which is now before the House brings before it, if adopted, H. R. 5098, to enable the Secretary of Agriculture to conduct research on foot-and-mouth disease and other diseases of animals.

The rule provides for 1 hour of general debate, after which the bill will be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. Points of order are waived.

Mr. Speaker, I intend to impose myself upon the House but for a very brief period. Every man who has had anything to do with livestock lives in dread of the foot-and-mouth disease. We have had some experience with it in years gone by and those of us who have encountered it have learned that it is the most contagious and infectious disease known in the animal kingdom. No cure has as yet been achieved, or any preventative. The only weapon which has been used for its extinction when it breaks out in a certain area is wholesale slaughter of all infected animals in that area.

The disruption caused by such a performance in the livestock industry itself and in the whole economy of the country is exceedingly serious. We are threatened with this thing today. Back in 1946, due to the unfortunate importation into the Republic of Mexico of some cattle from Brazil, the foot-and-mouth disease broke out in Mexico, in the central and southern parts of the country. The Mexican Government and the Mexican livestock industry were not able to combat it, and our Government, recognizing the danger to our own security inherent in this situation embarked upon a program of assisting the Mexicans in stamping out the disease. I think my recollection is correct when I say that

the American Government, in cooperation with the Mexican Government, has spent \$65,000,000 within the borders of Mexico in a desperate attempt to stamp out this disease. Through the fault of no one particularly, but as the result of exceedingly difficult conditions confronted in Mexico, especially with the rural population, the Mexican Indians, the attempt has failed, and the best that has been accomplished is the drawing of a quarantine line across the Republic of Mexico about 300 miles south of the Mexican-United States border, a line which is being held, or at least, desperate attempts are being made for the holding of that line, to prevent any infected animals crossing it and coming into northern Mexico which, of course, is the region immediately adjoining Texas, New Mexico, Arizona, and California, a region of the United States which is filled with livestock. What success will be achieved in holding that line, none of us knows. It is a pretty desperate situation.

May I say, Mr. Speaker, that this disease has been known in England for some years, with greater or less severity, and British scientists and laboratory research people have been working on it to see if they could not prevent the disease or bring about a cure. It has been known, as most of you realize, in the Argentine for many years, with the result that for our own protection we have had to impose certain import restrictions against the Argentine-livestock industry. From Brazil it made its way into Mexico, and coming into Mexico it stands as a threat and a terrible menace to the economy of the United States. It affects every cloven-hoofed animal; cattle, sheep, hogs, and also deer. The infection may be carried by wild deer coming across the mountains or the prairies. Once it is established in an area, the only known thing to do today is to slaughter every animal in the area.

We have had two outbreaks that I can recollect. One of them had its origin, strange to say, the State of Michigan where, as the result of the importation of some hog cholera virus in material infected with foot-and-mouth disease the latter disease spread over five or six States of the Union. There was another bad outbreak in California not many years ago which cost the State and the Government over \$200,000,000 to slaughter thousands and thousands of creatures.

This bill proposes that the Department of Agriculture shall establish a scientific research undertaking to see if the scientists cannot find a preventive or cure, or both, for this disease. Research has been conducted, perhaps not in a largely organized way, in other countries, but certainly it is up to us, in my humble judgment, to authorize the establishment of such an undertaking.

The authors of the bill, conscious of the danger of infection, have inserted in it an amendment to the effect that such research laboratory shall be established within the territorial possessions of the United States, but, more than that,

it must be established upon an island surrounded by deep navigable water, so as to reduce to a minimum the danger of the spread of infection from this laboratory. The members of the Committee on Rules believe that that amendment is a worthy one, and that it would go far toward reassuring the people of the country that this virus would not be brought in in such fashion and in such neighborhoods as to constitute a menace.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from New York has explained the rule and the provisions of the bill which the rule makes in order. May I say that I fully appreciate the need for this legislation by reason of the fact that we have already authorized and have expended \$60,000,000 in aiding Mexico in stamping out the dangerous foot-and-mouth disease infecting thousands of head of cattle in that country. Our help has been directed to prevent the spread of the disease over our border to protect our livestock, and, therefore, I favor this rule which will make in order for consideration the bill which will provide additional funds for research that I hope, eventually, will result in the eradication of this dreadful animal disease. The bill provides:

That the act of May 29, 1884 (23 Stat. 31), as amended, is hereby amended by adding a new section 12 reading as follows:

"SEC. 12. The Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to establish research laboratories, including the acquisition of necessary land, buildings, or facilities, and also the making of research contracts under the authority contained in section 10 (a) of the Bankhead-Jones Act of 1935, as amended by the Research and Marketing Act of 1946, for research and study, in the United States or elsewhere, of foot-and-mouth disease and other animal diseases which in the opinion of the Secretary constitute a threat to the livestock industry of the United States: *Provided*, That no live virus of foot-and-mouth disease may be introduced for any purpose into any part of the mainland of the United States except coastal islands separated therefrom by waters navigable for deep-water navigation, and except further, that in the event of outbreak of foot-and-mouth disease in this country, the Secretary of Agriculture may, at his discretion, permit said virus to be brought into the United States under adequate safeguards. To carry out the provisions of this section the Secretary is authorized to employ technical experts or scientists without regard to the Classification Act: *Provided*, That the number so employed shall not exceed five and that the maximum compensation for each shall not exceed \$15,000 per annum. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as Congress may deem necessary; in addition, the Secretary is authorized to utilize, in carrying out this section, funds otherwise available for the control or eradication of such diseases."

Mr. Speaker, while I shall support and vote for this meritorious bill, I am more greatly concerned in the consideration and enactment of a bill which passed the Senate last year and which was favorably reported by the House Committee on Foreign Affairs. Unlike the bill now before us, which proposes to conduct research to eradicate foot-and-mouth disease in cattle and other animals, it is aimed to effect an organization of the leading physicians and surgeons of all the countries of the world to conduct a medical research and to spread medical knowl-

edge to protect the health and safeguard the lives of human beings. The bill to which I refer is that which proposes to make the United States a member of the World Health Organization of the United Nations. Unfortunately, the Committee on Rules had withheld action in granting a rule for the consideration of the bill, which I think is a grave mistake. Within the past few days I have received more than 100 letters urging consideration of the legislation without delay, and stressing the necessity of our joining the World Health Organization to maintain our leadership in public-health matters. I have in my hand a letter addressed to me by Dr. John C. Kidneigh, associate director of the college of science, literature, and the arts, of the University of Minnesota, expressing his views as to the need for our participation in this organization. With the permission granted me, I include it as part of my remarks:

UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA,
COLLEGE OF SCIENCE, LITERATURE,
AND THE ARTS,
Minneapolis, April 1, 1948.

Hon. ADOLPH J. SABATH,
House of Representatives Office
Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SABATH: I believe that the Rules Committee of the House of Representatives tabled a bill passed by the Senate in 1947 ratifying the constitution of the World Health Organization and making the United States a member of that body. Our country was one of the many nations that took part in the International Health Conference in New York City in 1946, at which time the constitution of WHO was written and an interim commission set up. Unless our Congress ratifies this constitution, the United States will neither have representation among the officers of WHO nor maintain its proper place as a leader in controlling the spread of diseases between the peoples of the world. Will you please do something to remove this bill from the table and urge its acceptance by the House. The health and welfare of too many people are at stake for such a bill as this to be stopped by the pressure of other business or of misguided opponents.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN C. KIDNEIGH,
Associate Director.

Mr. Speaker, I also include a letter directed to me by Dr. Francis J. Gerty, director of the psychiatric division, Illinois Neuropsychiatric Institute, College of Medicine, University of Illinois. It expresses his deep concern in our failure to join the World Health Organization in which 23 nations have already announced participation. His letter is as follows:

UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS,
COLLEGE OF MEDICINE,
Chicago, Ill., March 30, 1948.

Hon. ADOLPH J. SABATH,
House of Representatives Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SABATH: I have been informed that the Rules Committee of the House of Representatives has tabled the bill passed by the Senate in 1947 ratifying the constitution of the World Health Organization, a bill already approved by the House Committee on Foreign Affairs.

This gives me grave concern because it means that the United States will not have membership in the World Health Organization which 23 nations have already approved. We shall have no representative at the Geneva meeting in June 1948. This is particularly embarrassing as we had taken a very

active part in the International Health Conference in 1946 which set up the Interim Commission.

Can you inform me as to why the House Rules Committee tabled this bill? What are the prospects of reversing this action?

Very truly yours,

FRANCIS J. GERTY, M. D.,
Director, Psychiatric Division,
Illinois Neuropsychiatric Institute.

Mr. Speaker, without unduly encumbering the RECORD, under the leave granted me, I shall include several more letters among the hundred or more which I have received from the heads and professors of universities and organizations who have appealed to me to cooperate in obtaining early action for the consideration of this legislation, as follows:

MATERNITY CENTER ASSOCIATION,
New York, N. Y., April 2, 1948.

Hon. ADOLPH J. SABATH,
House of Representatives Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SABATH: Health is above politics—your health and mine. It is one of the few realms of human activity on which the peoples of the world agree and on which they can work together in these days of crisis and misunderstanding. For that reason, I am writing to you about the World Health Organization. Cholera in China can be our business and very serious business indeed. Hoof-and-mouth disease in Mexico can menace our farmers and the price of meat. Air travel has brought the reservoirs of once remote epidemic diseases close to our shores. The newest knowledge about a medical or public health technique or drug developed in Sweden or Australia or Switzerland or Argentina may save lives in Illinois if we in the United States can learn of it quickly.

The purpose of the World Health Organization is to spread this knowledge and to work together to promote health and to save life wherever it is menaced in the world. The Strong voice of the United States is needed in the counsels of the WHO. Our skills and money have much to contribute to world health but WHO is a means of bringing the knowledge and skills of other countries to bear upon the health and well-being of our own people.

I ask you as a member of the Rules Committee of the House of Representatives to do your utmost to secure the ratification of the constitution of the World Health Organization. This is one of the positive things which we in the United States must do today for the development of understanding and cooperation among the nations of the world.

Sincerely yours,

Mrs. SHEPARD KRECH,
President.

TOPEKA, KANS., April 2, 1948.
The Honorable ADOLPH J. SABATH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SABATH: I am writing to you as a member of the House Rules Committee, and have selected your name, first, because there is no Representative from the State of Kansas on your committee; and secondly, as a former resident of the State of Illinois, I am well acquainted with your record in the House.

The purpose in my writing is to protest the tabling of the bill passed by the Senate, ratifying the constitution of the World Health Organization. In view of the fact that this bill has been passed by the Senate and ratified by the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, plus the fact that the World Health Organization is likely to come into being without the participation of the United States, unless the bill reaches the floor of the House and is acted upon favorably, I deeply regret this action of your committee.

As a practicing psychiatrist, as a former member of the armed services, and as a citizen I feel it is extremely important that the United States does participate in the World Health Organization, and would very much like to see you and the other members of the committee put your efforts behind bringing it to the floor for favorable action by the House of Representatives.

I would appreciate it if you would bring these thoughts of mine to the attention of the other members of the committee.

Sincerely yours,

LEWIS L. ROBBINS, M. D.

THE TULANE UNIVERSITY OF
LOUISIANA, SCHOOL OF MEDICINE,
New Orleans, March 31, 1948.

Hon. ADOLPH J. SABATH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN SABATH: I note that the Rules Committee has indefinitely tabled the bill to make the United States a member of the World Health Organization of the United Nations.

This letter is a plea that you reconsider this action so that the bill may be reported out for vote. The United States has a most important place in the health affairs of the world at the present time. Unless our country supports this organization, our leadership in public health matters in the world may be jeopardized.

Sincerely,

W. A. SODEMAN, M. D.,
Professor and Chairman of Department.

I was especially impressed in reading a letter from Dr. Roland R. Cross, director of health of the State of Illinois, who makes an interesting statement as to the effectiveness of the work of the League of Nations on international health matters, and I take the liberty of including it as part of my remarks:

STATE OF ILLINOIS,
DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC HEALTH,
Springfield, March 30, 1948.

Hon. ADOLPH J. SABATH,
United States Representative,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I was sharply surprised lately to learn that the Rules Committee of the House had tabled the bill which would ratify the constitution of the World Health Organization and make the United States a member of that body. Inasmuch as the bill had passed the Senate and had been approved by the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, the action of the Rules Committee was all the more surprising to me.

Undoubtedly the Rules Committee was motivated by reasons that appeared justifiable, although I am at a loss to know what those reasons could have been. It seems to me that an official international agency for controlling diseases and improving health has everything to recommend it and very little of significance against it. I know that the work of the old League of Nations on international health matters was of great benefit in the control of epidemic diseases. The Pan American Conference has been of substantial benefit along the same lines as have other agencies with an international complexion.

Unless there is some profound reason to the contrary, which does not suggest itself to me, I would urge that the Rules Committee reconsider the bill that would ratify the World Health Organization. From the standpoint of protecting and improving health and perhaps, indirectly, international relations, it seems to me that the World Health Organization would be an agency of the highest importance.

I shall be glad to hear from you concerning this matter.

Very truly yours,

ROLAND R. CROSS, M. D.,
Director of Public Health.

Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that we have already appropriated \$60,000,000 to aid in the elimination of diseases of cattle, it appears ridiculous to me to delay the consideration of legislation which will affect the health of millions of persons, and especially so in view of the fact that the authorization to permit our participation in the World Health Organization involves only an expenditure of a few thousand dollars.

I think it is improper to withhold action on this important legislation, and it is my hope that the gentleman who presented the rule this morning on the foot-and-mouth disease bill will cooperate with me in bringing about favorable consideration in the reporting of a rule to bring this vital and important legislation before the House.

Mr. Speaker, I do not wish to delay the House any longer. I have called attention to this important piece of legislation and I hope that shortly we will be able to have a vote in the Committee on Rules, which will make it possible for the membership to vote on this legislation, because I know a vast majority of the Members and the American people favor it. I feel it should be enacted.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

(Mr. SABATH asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE].

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, this is an important bill, as the gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH] has so pointedly said. It proposes to find a way to control the hoof-and-mouth disease, which has heretofore been regarded as controllable only when every exposed animal could be slaughtered.

The Appropriations Committee responded readily to the situation when it arose last year. We promptly reported appropriations as requested. The outbreak in Mexico, however, according to evidence brought before us, became virtually uncontrollable.

The problem of wild deer alone, acting as carriers, made capture and slaughter a virtual impossibility.

The necessity of paying the Mexican cattle owners enough to insure against hardship bordered closely to offering them so much that some were tempted to get quick money by suggesting that their cattle were exposed.

The difficulty of getting machinery for burying the slaughtered cattle was great in the out-of-the-way places. So another way had to be found.

The bill which is before us proposes to find a way to control this virus disease. It proposes a research program to go along with direct control methods. No one knows how soon a method of satis-

factory control can be found, or even whether it can be found. The disasters that would follow from an outbreak of hoof-and-mouth disease among cloven-hoof animals in this country, however, would be so great that it is imperative that an effort be made to see what can be done. That is why this bill is before us, and why it ought to pass.

The stockmen of western South Dakota would endorse my words, I am sure, when I say this bill is a "must."

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from California [Mr. ANDERSON].

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that in connection with the resolution presented by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE] this morning that the report which accompanies House Resolution 511 be printed in the RECORD following the reading of the resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. HINSHAW].

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed out of order and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. HINSHAW. I appreciate the action of the gentleman from New York, [Mr. WADSWORTH] in giving me this 5 minutes to discuss briefly an exceedingly important aspect of our air power. At this time, right today, the aviation industry in the United States is in the very dangerous position of having to lay off thousands of employees because orders have run out. One might say that fact is not something that should directly concern us particularly, but if one did say that he would be absolutely wrong, because we are vitally concerned in building the air power of the United States, producing additional aircraft. Let me give you some facts and figures.

Today we are building aircraft at the rate of about 18,000,000 airframe pounds per annum. We are withdrawing aircraft from storage at the rate of about 45,000,000 airframe pounds per annum. At that rate we are bringing into service 63,000,000 airframe pounds per annum, and it is to be hoped that with that quantity we can sustain the present 55-group program until 1950 or 1951 when the supply of effective aircraft in storage will be exhausted.

Remember, however, that the present production rate is less than 20,000,000 airframe pounds per annum. It takes from a year to a year and a half to double the production of an aircraft plant. If we are to be able to keep abreast of even the normal aircraft attrition of the air force and the Navy in 1950 and 1951, when the storage aircraft are completely exhausted, it is necessary to start at once

to repair the probable damage of the future by doubling and trebling the production of aircraft in the United States because it will take that long to increase production from the present 18,000,000-pound rate to 63,000,000 pounds. That is only to break even with the 55-group program. If we are to go into the 70-group program, which many of us believe is highly necessary, then we must begin immediately to step up that production even faster, because at best it will be 1952 and possibly 1953 before the 70-group program can be fully implemented.

I am glad to see the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER], chairman of the Appropriations Committee, on the floor. It is imperative that contract authorizations be issued at once so that we may start to prepare for 1950 at the earliest point, and 1952 and 1953 at the latest. It takes from 5 to 7 years to develop a new aircraft. If we are going to have the air power needed to preserve the peace and defend the United States, we have got to be about it today. If we wait until after the 30th of June, at the expiration of this fiscal year, we will delay the program probably 6 months, and not merely the 3 months between now and then.

Mr. LEA. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HINSHAW. I yield.

Mr. LEA. Can the gentleman state whether or not plans are now available for the construction of the types of aircraft needed?

Mr. HINSHAW. They are practically all available for the construction of these aircraft. Certain of them are still research and development contracts, but many of them are ready to produce, and many are now in actual production, but at a slow rate.

Mr. LEA. I commend the gentleman for bringing this to the attention of the Congress, and I join in his recommendations.

Mr. HINSHAW. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HINSHAW. I yield to the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. HALLECK. Is it true that your group has proposed numerous bills for consideration by the appropriate committees and Congress?

Mr. HINSHAW. This morning we have introduced 14 bills and 2 resolutions to implement the Congressional Aviation Policy Board's report. We hope for early consideration by the respective committees to which they have been assigned.

Mr. HALLECK. I would like to say that many times special committees of Congress and other committees are criticized because they have investigated and do not bring forward any constructive suggestions. Of course, I do not know anything about the various measures the members of your policy board have introduced, or what will eventually happen with respect to them, or what their merits may be, but certainly the gentleman and his associates are to be commended for bringing forward specific

proposals for the consideration of the Congress.

Mr. HINSHAW. I thank the distinguished gentleman. We have worked against time.

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HINSHAW. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. DORN. I would also like to compliment the gentleman and this joint board for taking this step and for formulating a policy and having some definite program. When the President of the United States came here he did not mention this program at all. I wish to compliment the gentleman for going ahead with what he thinks is right to defend this country. I would like to ask the gentleman this question: This 70-group Air Force is the minimum for defense; is that not true?

Mr. HINSHAW. No; the minimum for defense is a 55-group force. The minimum for defense and a sustained offensive retaliation in the event we are attacked is the 70-group program, and that is the program which your Congressional Aviation Policy Board believes is the program that should be adopted.

Mr. DORN. I thank the gentleman very much. Frankly, I should like to see it a 100-group Air Force.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BREHM].

Mr. BREHM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to speak out of order and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. BREHM. Mr. Speaker, the threat to our Government by communism operating within the borders of our country is no idle dream. Communism will thrive if our economy ceases to provide the adequate standards of living to which our citizens feel entitled in this richest of all nations. Every American can truly thank God for the opportunity and freedom under which we have lived, and by which we have achieved a standard of living which has surpassed that of any nation in the world. If we can maintain this high standard, and continue to increase it, and show to the world that under our form of government life is more abundant than any other form, our Republic is safe. To do this, we must not neglect any large segment of our population.

It has been pointed out on this floor many times that our economy is falling short in its provision for those who perhaps because of adversity in their younger years were unable to make adequate financial provision for the future and who now due to advanced years find it impossible to continue earning a livelihood. Old-age assistance in the United States provides a very meager sum for retirement. In fact the average appropriation by the Federal Government averages around 60 cents per day, and in many States far less than that. I feel

there is not a Member of the House but will agree that this condition should be remedied. In view of the stupendous amounts we appropriate for other purposes, I can see no excuse to continue these paltry sums for our deserving elder citizens.

Again, Mr. Speaker, the payment of a just and reasonable American pension will not benefit the elder citizens alone. If the children, for instance, who even now may be having a hard time making ends meet, but realizing they do have a responsibility to their parents, could have the assurance that their fathers and mothers would be adequately provided for in their declining years, would it not boost their morale and add tremendous value to their citizenship? Would it not also mean much to these young people if they had the assurance that if through no fault of their own they should reach the sunset of life and find themselves in a position of uncertain social security that a grateful Nation would be standing by ready to provide each of them with a decent retirement income for life? Would this assurance not add tremendous value to our citizenship? Would it not be an added incentive for them to stand valiantly forth as defenders and protectors of the form of government which we enjoy in our Republic? Yes, Mr. Speaker, it should go a long way to improve the high character of our citizenship. It should immeasurably reduce the crime wave. It should add a greater meaning to the value of our American institutions and traditions. Would it not be a bulwark against every enemy of the Nation, both without and within? Would it not be a good antidote against every enemy, including communism? Let us enact an adequate, uniform, American pension to take the place of our inadequate old-age assistance. Let us do it in this Congress.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. MILLER].

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I would recommend to my colleagues that they support the amended bill H. R. 5098, to provide for experimentation with the live virus of foot-and-mouth disease. To you, who may not be familiar with this disease, permit me to say that foot-and-mouth disease is one of the most infectious and destructive of livestock diseases. While the mortality rate may not be more than 5 percent in adult animals, it is much higher in the young stock and the after results of the disease persist for many years. It is devastating to the livestock industry. It is different than rinderpest, which is highly contagious; it does not spread quite as fast, but has much higher mortality rate. The mortality rate from rinderpest is frequently 100 percent.

Our Government, in cooperation with the War Department and the Canadian Government during the war, established a laboratory at Grosse Ile, which is in Canadian waters, for the purpose of experimentation on the disease of rinderpest. It is my understanding that a vaccine has now been developed which can protect animals from this disease. It

seems quite likely similar results could be obtained on foot-and-mouth disease after proper experimentations were carried on.

Foot-and-mouth disease affects all cloven-hoofed animals. It came into Mexico through the illegal importation of Brahma bulls from South America. The agreement between Mexico and the United States on the importation of live animals from countries having foot-and-mouth disease was broken. That is now water over the dam. There is no question but some individuals in Mexico and in this country made huge profits on the action and at the same time have fastened the disease upon Mexico for many years to come, perhaps permanently.

Foot-and-mouth disease has appeared in the United States six times in the past 50 years. The last outbreak was in 1929. In 1914 it was found to exist in 22 States and the District of Columbia. Our country has always followed a program of strict quarantine, with a slaughtering and burying of all infected and exposed animals. It is the only known method to date of eradicating the disease. This program must be followed until a suitable vaccine or other method is discovered to control the disease.

I have always felt, Mr. Speaker, that the veterinarian and science has not kept step and made progress in trying to ferret out ways and means of controlling foot-and-mouth disease. This country has been far behind England, Switzerland, and Denmark, where they have constantly had the disease on their doorstep. It is my understanding that Switzerland and Denmark have been working on a vaccine which seems to me to bring fairly good results. No experimentation on the live virus has been permitted in the United States. However, as a medical man, I recognize that medical science has been able to conquer many diseases which in the past have been fatal to large masses of our population. They did this by working with the live virus in laboratories and in universities all over the country. Tremendous progress is still being made to master some of the diseases which claim a high mortality percentage. I have every confidence that the diseases will be mastered one by one through work in the laboratories. I have enough faith in American science to believe that in the not too distant future we will conquer foot-and-mouth disease. It cannot be done without study and research. This bill provides for a method to move ahead in this field of research. Research is nothing more than seeking out from nature the unknown and trying to understand and master the problem.

We have foot-and-mouth disease within 300 miles of our border. It is a constant menace because we know it can be spread through roaming animals and even carried on the clothing of individuals. It would seem to me that we have the immediate problem of trying to control and keep the disease as far from our borders as is possible. In that respect we must continue in trying to get the Mexican Government to properly cooperate in containing this disease. The cooperation and the results with the Mexican Government to date have not been satisfactory.

I should also like to point out, Mr. Speaker, that the Bureau of Animal Industry in the Department of Agriculture, in my opinion, has not only been lax but derelict in its duty, since they have permitted horses trained for rodeo, to appear at numerous rodeo shows in Mexico City and the areas infected with foot-and-mouth disease. While it is true that the horse is immune from the disease, it can certainly be a carrier in that its hoofs and hair cannot be properly sterilized when they come back into this country. Regulations ought to be immediately put into effect to prevent horses going into this infected area, which in turn might bring the infection into our country. Certainly the Department is playing with fire when they permit this practice to continue.

You will recall, Mr. Speaker, that you placed me on a committee to visit the disease area in Mexico last year. I came back and gave a rather pessimistic account of what was occurring in Mexico, and gave as my opinion in July of last year, that the present methods being used by the Department of Agriculture and Mexico were unsatisfactory and that the disease would continue to spread without complete cooperation between the two Governments. In November 1947, we were notified that the slaughtering and burying program had to be discontinued. We have spent more than \$40,000,000 and have obligated \$61,000,000 in trying to eradicate the disease. It may take many hundreds of millions more, but if we can keep the disease from getting into our country the effort and money spent will be worth while. It is to be hoped that the Agriculture Department and the Bureau of Animal Industry will recognize that they must have top administrators handling the program if they are to expect any degree of success.

They are starting to use a vaccine in Mexico, its value is indeed very doubtful. They have established a line across Mexico and with a buffer zone, and if they carry out the program of keeping this area clean through the method of killing and burying all infected animals, some good may be accomplished. A fence across this area, in my opinion, would be of doubtful benefit. I would much prefer to see a high tight-wire fence along the Mexican and United States boundary, with more patrols and supervision of this area. I suggested last July, that if the disease broke through into northern Mexico, that this country ought to consider cleaning out an area 50 miles wide on our own territory and destroy and keep out of the area all cloven-hoofed animals. This is drastic medicine, but this disease requires the most drastic and positive action if it is to be controlled.

For a long-range program it would seem wise to have laboratory facilities on some island or area within the United States for the purpose of studying the disease. If we are to follow the plan used by the medical profession in using the live virus under proper control, I believe it would bring little or no hazard to the livestock population of the country. I realize that there are many objections to using the live virus and I am not

sure that this method should be pursued at this time. I would prefer to leave that to the judgment of veterinarians who have worked with the disease for many years and understand the risks, if any, that might be taken should a laboratory be established within the United States.

We ought to send good research men immediately to other countries where they have laboratories and gain all the information possible, which would assist us in perfecting a vaccine to bring protection from or a cure of this disease. If we were to establish a laboratory, it would take years to get the proper buildings and facilities. Other countries now have going laboratories and much information which I am sure would be available to the scientists of this country. Distance today means little because airplane service places all of us within 48 hours of any point in the world. I would prefer to see a permanent laboratory under our own supervision than to have it located in Mexico where the Government is none too stable and whose cooperation in the past has not always been good.

I would point out that we did master rinderpest in a short time. Perhaps with intensive research the same results could be accomplished with foot-and-mouth disease. At least it ought to be tried.

The long-range program could very well dovetail into a short-term program. The time is short and immediate action is needed. We ought to take every advantage possible of what other countries are doing. We can benefit by their experience.

I recommend this bill to my colleagues for passage. I am sure you know full well that if foot-and-mouth disease fastens itself upon the country, as it has upon Mexico, that it could well cost the livestock industry a billion or more dollars every year.

I have every confidence that science will master this dread disease. We should implement the program and go firmly forward with a program designed to eradicate foot-and-mouth disease in all cloven-hoofed animals.

(Mr. MILLER of Nebraska asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. GARMATZ asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include addresses by Hon. Thomas Alesandro, Jr., mayor of Baltimore, Md., and General Gerow.

AUTHORIZING RESEARCH ON FOOT-AND-MOUTH DISEASE

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 5098) to enable the Secretary of Agriculture to conduct research on foot-and-mouth disease and other diseases of animals and amend the act of

May 29, 1884 (23 Stat. 31), as amended, by adding another section.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 5098, with Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. GILLIE].

Mr. GILLIE. Mr. Chairman, I have made several speeches on the floor in connection with this problem. I think it is very well known to everyone here concerning the outbreak we have had in Mexico and is still raging there. The situation is not getting any better.

When Mexico decided to change the program from kill and bury to vaccination and quarantine, they established immediately a quarantine line through the middle of Mexico. On that quarantine line we have all of our men at this time. There are none of our men from the Bureau working down in the central part of Mexico except those in the offices in Mexico City. There are some 1,500 or 1,600 Mexican soldiers patrolling that border, but patrolling the border in an effort to keep the disease below this particular line is going to be a superhuman effort and I doubt very much whether they will ever keep it below that line. Perhaps in a matter of a year from now we may be able to stay down there for 2 years and hold that line, but some day it is going to break through, then look out.

As the gentleman from Nebraska, Dr. MILLER, said just a few minutes ago, the disease itself would very likely break through in case there should be a let-down on that quarantine line. Except for six outbreaks, we have always been free of the foot-and-mouth disease in this country. Now we have the foot-and-mouth disease in the country next to us. I might say in connection with that that there are only five countries left where there is no foot-and-mouth disease. They are: The United States, Canada, Australia, New Zealand, and Colombia in South America. Those are the only five countries now remaining which do not have the foot-and-mouth disease. The problem is going to change, because it looks to me now we are going to have to live with it; I mean, live with it next door. If that is true, then we have got to change our thinking on this matter, and for that reason I have introduced this bill to build a research laboratory.

This research laboratory will be built on some island somewhere close to the United States. Our scientists have looked at several places along the eastern coast, and they would like to have it along the eastern coast, because of one very important reason, and that is the proximity to the metropolitan centers where they can draw scientific men, such as Rockefeller research laboratories, and institutions of that sort. We have got to have it some place close to these great scientific research centers, because if

we do not, then the matter of travel will be too great, and as a result, they will not get the right kind of scientists to help in this very important work.

As I said before, the main question before us today is, How are we going to control this outbreak which now rages in Mexico? Perhaps 2 years from now they might have a different government down there and they would force all of our men up to our own border. I would not want to see that happen either, because if the disease ever gets close to our border, it is going to get into this country. I think it was the gentleman from Nebraska, Dr. MILLER, who called attention to drawing a line on this side of our border, a protective zone, 50 miles wide. Well, a protective zone 50 miles wide along the lower border of Texas would result in an enormous loss to those people down there. It would mean a loss of more than a billion dollars just in that State alone. Now, we cannot afford to do that. The next best thing to do is to get this laboratory built just as quickly as possible in order that they may develop a vaccine that will produce a permanent immunity. There have been several vaccines introduced in Europe which only give about 5 or 6 months' immunity. Well, that means vaccinating the cattle twice a year. When you get into the large herds like they have in the West and Southwest, that would be just an impossible job. It would not be practicable.

We have scientists over in Europe and we have some in the Argentine studying the foot-and-mouth disease at the present time.

I think it is pretty well understood that this program has changed down in Mexico. Some 800,000 head of cattle were killed and buried, but Mexico felt that they could not stand that strain on their economy. That is the reason they had to change. That was bad news for us, because it means that someday maybe we are going to have that disease in this country.

I have been through one of these foot-and-mouth scourges, back in 1914, and it is a terrible thing. We destroyed one of the finest herds of Galloway cattle in the United States. There were 75 head; we shot and buried them right there. That is just what is going to take place if it ever comes into this country. Personally I would want to continue to use this method to keep the disease out of this country. The only place we could use vaccine in this country, perhaps, would be in New Mexico or other places along the border, where, if the disease broke out, we could ring it by vaccinations for say 10, 15, or 20 miles around. That would perhaps stop it from spreading. But one wonders just how this thing spreads. I remember in 1914 the disease was on a farm close to Mapleton, Ind., and we thought we had it stopped right there. The next place it broke out was more than 4½ miles away from this place. No one has ever been able to explain how that disease got over to the next farm 4½ miles away. You see how dangerous it is. As the gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH] said earlier, he has been through this himself, and he knows what a dangerous disease it is. So

I am very anxious that this program be carried out and we get our laboratory set up as soon as possible.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GILLIE. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I am interested in the vaccine that has been tried in Europe. Can the gentleman tell us something about its effectiveness? What are the prospects of developing a vaccine that would give permanent immunity?

Mr. GILLIE. They have a laboratory in Perbright, England, about 15 miles from the center of London. They are carrying on a program for 25 years, but they have never been able to produce a vaccine that would produce immunity for more than 6 months. Denmark is probably doing much further research along this line. They have a vaccine that will provide immunity for from 6 to 8 months. It is getting a little better all the time.

I know that we have the scientists and the skill and initiative to do this job, and our scientists, I am sure, could produce a vaccine that would set up permanent immunity. We did that very thing up in Grosse Ile during the war, producing a rinderpest vaccine that produced a permanent immunity. We did not know anything about this vaccine when we started, but our scientists produced a vaccine that was 100 percent perfect. We were afraid the Japanese were going to scatter the germs all over this country, but we were ready for them. We produced some 5,000,000 doses and never had to use one of them. That was the first time a permanent-immunity vaccine for rinderpest had ever been produced, and it took them less than a year to do it. They were able to produce that vaccine. Doctor Shope, who had charge of it, was from the Rockefeller Institute. Collaborating with him was Dr. R. A. Kelser, now president of the Veterinary College of the University of Pennsylvania.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Can the gentleman tell us something about whether there would be any danger of the spread of the disease if the laboratory were located off the east coast? I had a letter the other day from someone in New York protesting against placing the laboratory there. What would be the danger, if any, of having the disease spread from that island to the coast?

Mr. GILLIE. I do not think there would be very much danger. In the case of the Perbright Laboratory in England, they have been there for 25 years, and there has never been an outbreak.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Would the diseased animals be on that island? I take it they necessarily would.

Mr. GILLIE. The experimental animals would, but inside the laboratory always.

[Mr. WORLEY addressed the Committee. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

Mr. GRANGER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LYLE].

(Mr. LYLE asked and was granted permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LYLE. Mr. Chairman, scientific progress is often painful and generally somewhat frightening. How unfortunate it would be, however, if we permitted the threat of pain or danger to deter us in our quest for ways and means of wiping out disease.

It was shocking and astonishing to find recently that this country had done no research in the eradication of foot-and-mouth disease. Most of us—far too many of us—have been unconscious of the threat to this country of an invasion of this disease. Though we have experienced its destructive effect several times, we were able to stamp it out and it had never become fixed upon this continent. Unfortunately, today that is not true, for we live with it at our door. It is quite possible that today or tomorrow it will cross the border into California, Arizona, or Texas, and we stand helplessly and hopelessly with one weapon—slaughter and burial.

No one, I think, can estimate the cost to our economy that would result from such an invasion.

The proper location of a laboratory in which we may carry on scientific experiments leading to the development of an effective vaccine is not a question that can rightfully be decided on this floor. Your committee, headed by the able scientist, Dr. Gillie, is fully conscious of the dangers of such experiments. Their consideration of the danger led to the very careful drafting of this legislation. They will continue, I am sure, to use their knowledge and influence for the proper placement of such a laboratory and none of us need fear any reckless disregard for the welfare of the people or industry in the selection of a site.

This legislation is long overdue, Mr. Chairman. We must develop an effective vaccine. It must be done now. We cannot rely upon the scientists of other nations. We must use our own great resources and have the benefit of our own great scientists.

No Member of this House can cast a vote more vital to the welfare of our future economy than one for this bill. It is well to proceed with prudence and caution. It is folly to proceed with timidity in so vital an issue. Failure to pass this bill would border on stupidity, for it is not a measure affecting the welfare of the cattle industry, but a bill affecting the welfare of our Nation. I sincerely hope it will have your enthusiastic support.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. GRANGER. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

The CHAIRMAN. There being no further requests for time, the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the act of May 29, 1884 (23 Stat. 31), as amended, is hereby amended by adding a new section 12 reading as follows:

"SEC. 12. The Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to establish research laboratories,

including the acquisition of necessary land, buildings, or facilities, and also the making of research contracts under the authority contained in section 10 (a) of the Bankhead-Jones Act of 1935, as amended by the Research and Marketing Act of 1946, for research and study, in the United States or elsewhere, of foot-and-mouth disease and other animal diseases which in the opinion of the Secretary constitute a threat to the livestock industry of the United States. To carry out the provisions of this section, the Secretary is authorized to employ technical experts or scientists without regard to the Classification Act: *Provided*, That the number so employed shall not exceed five and that the maximum compensation for each shall not exceed \$15,000 per annum. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as Congress may deem necessary; in addition, the Secretary is authorized to utilize, in carrying out this section, funds otherwise available for the control or eradication of such diseases."

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, line 7, after the words "United States," strike out the period and insert in lieu thereof the following: "*Provided*, That no live virus of foot-and-mouth disease may be introduced for any purpose into any part of the mainland of the United States except coastal islands separated therefrom by waters navigable for deep water navigation, and except further, that in the event of outbreak of foot-and-mouth disease in this country, the Secretary of Agriculture may, at his discretion, permit said virus to be brought into the United States under adequate safeguards."

Mr. MACY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MACY to the committee amendment in the bill: On page 2, line 9, after the word "part" strike out the balance of the amendment and insert "of the continental limits of the United States."

Mr. MACY. Mr. Chairman, the district I represent, the First New York, takes in practically all that section of Long Island devoted to agriculture, the produce of which, together with the catch of fish and shellfish in the surrounding waters, makes it one of the greatest, if not the greatest, food-producing congressional districts in the United States. It goes without saying that I must be, and I am, wholeheartedly for the purpose of H. R. 5098 by Dr. GILLIE. What I am taking exception to is the location of the research laboratory on Long Island, where, with its large and growing population, the introduction of the virus of this dread foot-and-mouth disease would be dangerous and alarming.

It was my purpose first to suggest another amendment that I spoke to some Members of the House about, but, viewing this whole situation from a different, and, in my opinion, a more practical standpoint, let me hazard the thought that the presence of this dread foot-and-mouth disease on the southern boundary of our country demands action with all possible speed. I leave it to you to conjecture how long it will take, in these difficult building times, to erect and complete a \$25,000,000 laboratory on eastern Long Island and equip it fully. While the idea has just come to me, and I will say has not been considerably ex-

plored even by me, I would venture to say that temporary field laboratories on the very grounds where the disease is prevalent might prove far more expeditious and, at the same time, less costly, though I would not want to intervene the cost in this situation at all because the importance of eradicating this disease should not depend on cost. If experimental researches were to be quickly achieved, those laboratories abroad might be reinforced for immediate special study to the end that some more immediate corrective might evolve. The proposed several-year program would, in a measure, impeach the speed with which the instant legislation is being agitated.

It is interesting to note that Long Island's aversion to this project is shared by many other States having far longer coast lines, and especially that other great empire State, Texas, whose Cattle Raisers Association passed a resolution this past March at its seventy-first annual convention reiterating its opposition to the importation into the continental United States of the live virus of foot-and-mouth disease in any form or through any medium and expressing the hope that such research work be authorized and provision made outside of the United States.

I read a portion of what they had to say in a pamphlet issued March 17:

This association has heretofore on several occasions urged that the Department of Agriculture enter upon a program of scientific research into foot-and-mouth disease. We are aware of the fact that the Department of Agriculture now desires to institute a research program for the close study of foot-and-mouth disease in all its aspects.

Then they go on to speak of how important it is to the position they take right down on the boundary and they take the position they do not want to have it in any form in Texas or in continental United States. Therefore, I thought it was fair to introduce this resolution.

Another and important angle of this location question in any such thickly settled area of the country's eastern seaboard is transmission of the virus through the air, and that has not been scientifically eliminated, or through carriers. The Mosquito Commissions of Suffolk and Massau Counties do not yet have that insect under full control and the tick abounds in the neighborhood of the location purposed. The Rocky Mountain spotted fever, with a high fatality percentage, appeared in the township of East Hampton along about 1912 and there has been a moderate but steady increase on eastern Long Island since that time. Ticks appear to prefer a habitat along animal trails while waiting the passage of a host animal. Dealing with this situation, Dr. R. D. Glasgow, the New York State entomologist, and Dr. D. L. Collins, of the New York State science service, wrote a paper in the April 1946 Journal of Economic Entomology entitled "Control of the American Dog Tick, a Vector of Rock Mountain Spotted Fever: Preliminary Tests." Deer frequent these parts unregulated because there is no legal hunting season now prescribed. They are of the cloven hoof variety, sus-

ceptible to the foot-and-mouth virus. From what I have said, it does not take much imagination to conjure up the fears that will be entertained for the introduction locally of the foot-and-mouth virus, from which scientists have not yet proved the complete immunity of human beings.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman be permitted to proceed for one additional minute.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Chairman, I should like to ask the gentleman a question, if he will yield.

Mr. MACY. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KEOGH. I notice in the report of the Secretary of Agriculture that it reads as follows:

The most suitable location would be on a peninsula, from which traffic of the mainland could be carefully guarded.

I ask the gentleman if any part of Long Island will properly fall under that designation?

Mr. MACY. It would not seem to me so—connected, as it is, with large arterial highways and parks in that location where the people from the great metropolis of the city of New York spend a great deal of their summertime.

Mr. KEOGH. What is the population of Long Island, does the gentleman know?

Mr. MACY. The population of Long Island today is, roughly, 4,700,000.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has again expired.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman be permitted to proceed for two additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MACY. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I would like to make an observation, if the gentleman will permit, and then ask a question. When this matter came up before our Committee on Agriculture, I questioned the propriety or advisability of placing this laboratory on Long Island or other places where there was a bridge so that you could go from the mainland over the line of traffic to the laboratory. I did not like that. When I learned that it was going to be established on Long Island, I raised that question in committee. It was my hope that the Department could find some other location, and I think they can. I am inclined to agree with the gentleman's amendment in order to give them a chance to find a place which I believe will serve as good a purpose and protect the health of the livestock and also the people of the various communities.

Mr. MACY. I certainly welcome the friendly remarks of the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, we have a billion-dollar dairy industry in up-State New York. The gentleman's amendment certainly deserves the most careful consideration from those who are interested in preserving that industry. There are as many dairy cows in up-State New York as there are beef cattle in some of the great Western States. I should hate to see the foot-and-mouth disease get started in the dairy field. I should hate to see the placing of any laboratory anywhere near a great dairy section which takes care of the metropolitan districts of the country. The New York State milkshed supplies dairy products to untold millions in New York City, Philadelphia, Buffalo, Rochester, and others. We certainly do not want to see our industry jeopardized. For that reason I believe that the gentleman from New York has made a sound proposition at this time, and I am going to support his amendment.

I am supporting it for another reason. I have heard that a lot of these professors and medical men want to be near the big centers of population.

I believe Government service is predicated upon where you are assigned, not where you expect to choose your place of abode. For instance, I think the true, patriotic individual, whether he be in the higher brackets of Government service or in the lower brackets, should be perfectly willing to take an assignment whether it be in the Sahara Desert, in the wilds of Timbuctu, or anywhere else. I do not believe a man should insist on being assigned to New York City simply to be near the Stork Club or any other place of entertainment. The gentleman from New York has made a good proposal, which should be carefully considered by the House.

Meditation and thought should be given to the pursuit of one's duties in Government service in any place, whether it be a big city or some out-of-the-way locality. In other countries, scientific men go where they are placed. They go where it will be most advantageous to their work and to the government they are serving. Personal considerations are secondary. In the scientific professions, where it takes long hours of careful preparation, study, and the pursuit of knowledge in a laboratory, it makes little difference whether one is in a big city within easy reach of night life or out in the wide-open spaces.

I am reminded of these appropriate lines from *As You Like It*:

Sweet are the uses of adversity;
Which, like the toad, ugly and venomous,
Wears yet a precious jewel in his head;
And this our life, exempt from public haunt,
Finds tongues in trees, books in the running
brooks,
Sermons in stones, and good in everything.

I think these scientific men can well ponder over these lines and realize that whether they are sent to New York City or the plains of Monterrey, they certainly

owe it to the Government of the United States to go where they are assigned so that they can do properly and well the work they are cut out to do, and in this case so they can lick the foot-and-mouth disease for all time.

Mr. Chairman, I am for the amendment and hope it is adopted.

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York. The amendment offered by the committee permits the tests on research for a vaccine to be carried on on coastal islands but prohibits the live virus from being brought to the mainland. Now the Secretary of Agriculture should be left free to designate the island where this is to be done. He knows where it can be carried on to the best advantage and without danger of the virus getting to the mainland. It is not for this House to name the place. We will have prohibited the experiments on the mainland and it is believed that is sufficient from the standpoint of protection.

Mr. Chairman, I am glad to see this bill come out. The battle against the foot-and-mouth disease in Mexico has been a disappointment to many of us. It becomes apparent that it may be a long, long time before the disease is driven out of the confines of our neighboring republic. Therefore it is wise that, while continuing the fight south of the border, we also let the battle shift to the laboratories and the test tubes. The war against this infectious and destructive disease should and must be waged on every front and we must not relax our efforts. We must use every weapon at our command to keep the disease out of the United States and eventually out of the North American Continent.

(Mr. FISHER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks).

Mr. POTTS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I doubt very seriously that it was the intention of the framers of this proposed legislation to include within its scope an area which is so largely made up of actually, although not physically, an important part of the mainland of the United States. On Long Island there are contained two of the five counties of New York City. If you can find anything that is more representative of the mainland than that, I should like to know what it is. In this bill there is proposed this proviso, "That no live virus of foot-and-mouth disease may be introduced for any purpose into any part of the mainland of the United States except coastal islands separated therefrom by waters navigable for deep-water navigation."

Long Island fits within the exception to that proviso. It is a coastal island separated from the mainland by navigable waters for deep-water navigation. But it was never the intention that Long Island should come within this legislation. That is what happens here. As more positive manifestation of the fact that Long Island was not intended to be included in this legislation, let me

point out certain language on page 2 of the report on this bill. It says, "The most suitable location would be on a peninsula from which traffic from the mainland could be carefully guarded." Now we have bridges and ferries and a great deal of traffic between Long Island and Manhattan and the other boroughs of New York City. Technically Long Island fits within that description, but again I say it was never the intention to bring two-fifths of New York City along with the rest of Long Island into this legislation.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word and rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I almost earnestly ask you to support this amendment. As one of the Members from the Long Island area, it is incomprehensible to me that anyone should even consider putting this experimental station in such a place as Long Island. That station would be dealing with a deadly virus. You will agree with me that Long Island is not an island in the sense contemplated by the framers of this bill. With its bridges and tunnels. It is not really separated from the mainland at all.

Long Island is a vacation land and playland for about 20,000,000 people, and it is the home of about 5,000,000 people. Certainly that is no place to put an experimental station which is handling a deadly virus germ.

Mr. POTTS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LATHAM. I yield.

Mr. POTTS. As a matter of fact, we have a tunnel under the river connecting Long Island with the mainland which goes from Queens to Manhattan, so we have many, many modes of transportation from Long Island to the mainland.

Mr. LATHAM. As a matter of fact, so far as the purposes of this legislation are concerned, it is a part of the mainland, because the traffic is moving back and forth all the time. As the gentleman from New York [Mr. MACY] so well pointed out there are mosquitoes and many ticks on Long Island. There are also many wild animals there that could easily spread this disease. What a tragedy it would be to spread this deadly virus throughout this vacation land on Long Island.

There are a thousand places that you could put this station, so why pick on a place like Long Island?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, we are always afraid of the unknown. We are afraid of the thing that we do not know. The folks in New York are worried about the laboratory being situated someplace in a densely populated area. I call your attention to the fact that the big medical centers in New York have been working with live virus affecting human beings for many, many years that are even more deadly than the virus of the foot-and-mouth disease. We have no compunctions about bringing live virus affecting human beings into this country. They

are working on such virus diseases in New York City and in this city and in every other large city in an effort to control diseases affecting humans. If we had not been able to do that, we might not have been able to make any progress against the unknown virus diseases affecting human beings. So I hope that it will allay your fears somewhat if I tell you that bringing the live virus of the foot-and-mouth disease into such laboratories is not dangerous. Perhaps you do not like it right on your doorsteps but personally as a physician knowing what the medical profession is doing with unknown virus affecting human beings, I can tell you that it is safe. There is no danger of spreading these diseases to your children in New York or the folks in Washington or Baltimore or at the Mayo Brothers Clinic, in Rochester. It might be better to have this laboratory some place else. I think it ought to be put where it can best serve the purpose, where we can get the best scientists available. They have worked with it in Denmark and Switzerland and many large cities. However, as far as live virus coming into this country and being worked under the direction of scientists, it has been done and there has been no danger to the livestock industry.

Mr. MACY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I yield.

Mr. MACY. The committee in its wisdom put in an island as a qualification. Why did they put in an island if it is all right to have this virus right in the thickly settled centers? They must have had some reason.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. There, again, we are always afraid of the unknown.

Mr. GRANGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I yield.

Mr. GRANGER. Speaking about being afraid of the unknown, I wonder what position we would have taken had we known of the destructiveness of the atom bomb, when it was located right in the heart of some of our big cities. We would have been scared to death of it.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Yes. I think we overemphasize the fact that live virus may spread the disease in this country, because that has not occurred when we have worked with live virus. Many of them still have not been mastered. Many of them were brought from Africa and European countries. Many viruses that are deadly to human beings are being worked upon in many laboratories in the great centers of the population of the United States.

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I yield.

Mr. KEOGH. Do I understand the gentleman to say there might be a better place to put it than Long Island?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Oh, yes. I would not have any objection to putting it right here in the city of Washington.

Mr. KEOGH. Then why not put it some place other than Long Island?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I think it ought to be located where it is most accessible to the scientists who are to use

it, whether it is in Washington, D. C., or Long Island, or wherever it is. As far as danger from live virus is concerned, we are overemphasizing that particular phase of the question. Let us put the laboratory where it will do the most good.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Nebraska has expired.

Mr. GRANGER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, it is very easy to understand why everyone should be fearful of this dread disease. It should be said here that the committee had no intention, neither does this legislation intend, to select a location for this laboratory. We have talked about, and we have investigated, every alternative that has been suggested as to where the laboratory should be located. We decided, as a subcommittee at least, that that problem should best be left to the scientists who know most about this disease, to make the selection. We are not trying to locate it on Long Island. Maybe somebody has suggested that as a place, but, after all, I am sure the great State of New York, and the fine representation it has in this Congress, would be able to bring plenty of influence to bear to keep it from going there if it was advocated to build it on Long Island.

As Dr. MILLER has well said, we fear most the things we do not understand. I think we have been scared stiff on this matter, but this is what we have been doing: Every year since we have had this quarantine over the years, in 1946 we imported into this country out of hoof-and-mouth disease infested countries, 89,000,000 hides of cattle. They have been specially processed, and they have been watched, and, as far as I know, no outbreak has occurred through that source.

In 1947 we imported 82,000,000 hides from infested countries that came into this country under restrictions, properly processed and policed, and never yet have we had an outbreak of disease from that source.

We have also been importing cattle from infected areas in the last few years. We have imported from Britain, the very heart of a foot-and-mouth disease area. We imported 147 British cattle in 1946, and 153 in 1947. These of course are small numbers but they are breeding stock, a special kind of cattle. They have been under the supervision of our Bureau of Animal Industry. They have been properly quarantined, properly supervised, and so far no bad results have been experienced because of those importations; and I want to say, being a small cowhand myself, that I would not want to do a single thing that would impair the livestock or dairy industry of this country, not at all. I am convinced, however, that the scientists, and my friend, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. GILLIE], whom I am willing to follow in this matter, who has given it a great deal of study and who I am convinced in his own mind believes as the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. MILLER], and the scientists believe, that we can supervise it, keep it under control; and I think it is imperative and necessary that we begin today to talk about doing something to control this disease.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GRANGER. I yield.

Mr. WOLVERTON. I wish to ask the gentleman why the committee precluded the building of such a research laboratory on the mainland of the United States if there is nothing to fear?

Mr. GRANGER. I would not go so far as to say there is nothing to fear. There is, of course, an element of risk in it; but, as the gentleman knows, our committee investigated every suggested site and it was a matter of compromise as to what we would do about it. This is the best we could do.

Mr. WOLVERTON. The compromise eliminates the whole mainland. That is not much of a compromise.

Mr. GRANGER. The committee compromise was an added precaution.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Utah has expired.

(Mr. GRANGER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I believe any of us can easily understand the position of the gentleman from New York [Mr. MACY] in proposing this amendment. I have had, and I presume many other Members have had, numerous letters and telegrams from constituents of the gentleman from New York protesting against the location of a foot-and-mouth disease laboratory on Long Island. That is to be expected, because I do not know of any area which wants an institution of this kind. I believe the fears and apprehension which have inspired those letters and telegrams are largely unfounded for reasons which I will state in a moment. However, as long as those fears exist, the constituents of the gentleman from New York are going to expect him to do everything in his power to keep this laboratory from being located on Long Island. I and many others can testify that he is doing all that anyone could possibly do in that regard.

There has been, of course, no definite decision made as to where this laboratory will go, but it is my understanding that the officials of the Department of Agriculture who have studied the matter think that the best location is on Long Island, not in the populous part of Long Island, but way out at the tip end in a thinly settled part of that island. I am advised that in East Hampton Township, which is the area affected and which is 20 miles in length, there were, according to the 1940 census, 6,529 people. The largest village in that township is the village of Sag Harbor, with a population of 2,517 people in 1940. This is a long way from any populous area. Now, as far as livestock is concerned, it is thinly populated also. In the entire county of Suffolk there are only 5,899 cattle, according to the agricultural census of 1945. There were 4,234 hogs and 484 sheep. In the adjoining county of Nassau there are only about half that many cattle, about one-fourth that many hogs, and only 266 sheep. The average county in the United States has 25,000 cattle and 20,000 hogs. So this is not an area which would involve any

great danger as far as livestock is concerned, and it is not a congested area as to population. Even if it were a congested area, it should be considered that the English laboratory, which has been in existence for some 24 years, is located only 30 miles from the heart of London. Cattle graze within a mile and a half of this laboratory, yet there has never been a single instance where an outbreak of foot-and-mouth disease in England has been traced to this laboratory.

I think that the fears which have been expressed here are without any sound basis. It is contended or will be contended, if it has not been already, that this is an area with a fine beach not far away and that to establish this laboratory here will ruin the beach. In this connection, I want to read a statement from Dr. Simms, head of the Bureau of Animal Industry as to how this laboratory will be constructed and operated. I would like to have your close attention because this is very important. This statement reads as follows:

The laboratory will be completely enclosed by a concrete wall surmounted with a heavy link-chain fence. No infected cattle will be taken to the laboratory. The virus of foot-and-mouth disease will be used only within a completely closed unit. This unit will be screened. All air going in will be filtered. All air passing out of the closed unit will be sterilized. All animals used in experiments will be incinerated. All waste materials from the laboratory will be sterilized and all solid parts will be incinerated. After sterilization and filtration, the liquid waste material from the laboratory will be discharged through a pipe line into the ocean far enough from the shore so that it will have no effect whatsoever upon the waters along the shore line. The laboratory will not be a nuisance as it will have neither noises nor odors that will be objectionable. The design and structure will be such that it will be attractive in appearance.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kansas has expired.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for two additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, this is a very serious matter. We have failed in our campaign to eradicate the foot-and-mouth disease in Mexico. We do not know when we may have it in this country. As a matter of fact, we are lucky it is not here now. The only other method of attack that our scientists have devised so far is to go to the laboratory. We are behind in that. Other countries are far ahead in that respect. It is most essential from the standpoint of the livestock industry in this country that we set up and establish a laboratory and attack the problem most energetically on that front.

If the amendment we are now considering is adopted it would make this bill entirely worthless, because it provides that a laboratory shall not be set up within the continental limits of the United States. I understand if this amendment is voted down other restrictive amendments will be offered and what I have to say about this amend-

ment will apply to any other amendment of that nature. As serious a matter as this is, we are wasting our time and the money that may be spent upon this laboratory and it will be an expensive matter, unless we put it in the very best place that can be selected here in the United States.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. WOLVERTON. I noted that the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Agriculture stated there is a great deal of misapprehension and that the objections are not on a sound basis. Will the gentleman advise us as to the reason why the whole mainland of the United States was exempted? Was it under a misapprehension? Was it on a solid, sound basis, or what was the reason?

Mr. HOPE. I think that everyone who has studied the matter is in agreement that the best place to locate a laboratory of this kind is along the seashore, on an island or a peninsula, that is partly on account of the isolation that would come about and partly because of the ability to dispose of the waste matter out into the ocean by means of a pipeline as suggested by Dr. Simms. I would not be fair to my colleague if I did not say that every possible precaution must be taken to see that there is no chance for the virus to escape.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kansas has again expired.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may be permitted to proceed for two additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOPE. The more isolated the location you can select for this laboratory, the better it is. This location is an isolated location as far as proximity to a large livestock producing area is concerned and as far as proximity to great centers of population is concerned.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. WOLVERTON. I have in mind the argument that the gentleman made that a similar research laboratory is now located within 30 miles of London. If that argument was offered to be persuasive, why then did the committee exempt the whole mainland of the United States?

Mr. HOPE. Well, the gentleman will understand that one of the chief factors to be considered in the location of a laboratory of this kind is that it should be near centers of education and research, where you have available the scientific and medical men who will be able to devote, perhaps not all of their time, but part of their time to an enterprise of that kind. That is the reason that the laboratory was located so close to London, because they had the scientists and the medical men so readily available. Now, this location certainly

has a great advantage over the English location, because we have all of those advantages with reference to location near-by of educational institutions and scientific men, and at the same time we have the advantage of isolation.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kansas has again expired.

Mr. LEONARD W. HALL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman be permitted to proceed for one additional minute.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. LEONARD W. HALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. LEONARD W. HALL. The gentleman speaks of this as an isolated spot. Does he realize that this isolated spot that he talks about is near some of our best State parks where thousands of people visit each summer, and that this fluid from this laboratory is going to flow into the waters of the Atlantic Ocean along which we have Jones Beach, the greatest bathing beach in the world so far as numbers of people visiting it are concerned? Does the gentleman realize that when he speaks of this as an isolated spot?

Mr. HOPE. I understand that to be the situation, but I have already read the statement of Dr. Simms, who points out that the laboratory will be so constructed and so operated that it will not in any way interfere with the pleasure which the people may derive from State parks or from their use of the bathing beaches or any other uses which might be made of land in that vicinity.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kansas has again expired.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York be again read.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

(The Clerk again read the Macy amendment.)

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, it impresses me that there might be some merit in the point made by the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Agriculture to the effect that this amendment goes too far because by its terms, as I understand it, it would strike out the balance of the bill. I know the gentleman from New York has at the Clerk's desk a more limited amendment. I understand that amendment, on page 2, line 11, after the word "navigation" adds the words "and which shall not be connected with the mainland by any tunnel." That would be sufficient to prevent this laboratory from being placed on Long Island. I wonder if the gentleman from New York, to whom I would be happy to yield now, would be willing to ask unanimous consent to substitute

this amendment for the one he has offered.

Mr. MACY. The gentleman from New York has made the suggestion that I had at first contemplated placing before the House another amendment. As I said in my opening remarks, I presented the other, broader question for the discussion of the House in order to bring this question fully before the House. I shall be more than glad to accept that substitute amendment, if that is acceptable to the chairman and the Members of the House.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw the pending amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. MACY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MACY: On page 2, line 11, after "navigation" insert "and which shall not be connected with the mainland by any tunnel."

Mr. MACY. Mr. Chairman, I would not be before the House for 1 minute if I felt the question of location was free and open for decision, because I believe the arguments are so overwhelming against the Long Island location that it would never be given the slightest consideration. The fact is that these scientists from the United States Department of Agriculture have focused upon this Long Island location, and the inquiries I have so far made lead inescapably to the conclusion that this predetermination has already been reached. Hence, only an amendment such as I am now seeking will prevent that selection, and it will be necessary for the House, in conference with the Senate, which has already passed a similar bill with no restriction whatsoever as to location, to insist that the House bill, with my amendment, finally prevail.

Before even legislation was introduced, there was no consultation by these scientists with the duly elected Representative from the district, which I think every Member of the House would feel was a substantive right in the event that he were similarly affected. It almost looks as though the bill had been framed for the very purpose of taking Camp Hero. It was only rumors that representatives from the Department of Agriculture had been on the ground dangling a \$36,000,000 expenditure before those in the immediate locality to smooth the way that brought the matter to my attention, and then only I found that the House Committee on Agriculture had released the bill and immediately thereafter a rule had been granted for its admission to the floor.

When the 7,000 acres at Camp Upton were taken for war purposes and when this Camp Hero and other locations on Long Island were similarly taken, there was no opposition from those in our locality, who are certainly no less patriotic than those in any other section of the United States, but had they had any thought that these takings would be sub-

verted to other, and purposes disastrous to their well-being just because they were already in the grip of the Federal Government, it would have been another story. I submit that it is very unfair to bring any economy argument into this burning question that far transcends any question of money expenditure in the damage that may be wrought to the future of one of the fastest-growing areas in the United States. If the scientists were proceeding anew to make a purchase of this character, it is doubtful if they would be able to purchase at any price, or if resort was made to condemnation whether even that would be possible over the opposition that would surely arise were the people cognizant of what was in the wind.

The bill before us states that this foot-and-mouth laboratory shall not be located on the mainland of the United States but shall be built on a coastal island separated from it by deep navigable waters. This sounds admirable to me and to all dairymen concerned with the threat of this virulent scourge. It is comforting, indeed, to read lines 7 to 15 of this bill, for therein is manifested the clear intent to set up the proposed laboratory remote from centers of population and the proximity of cattle.

Long Island, the internationally known vacation land, technically meets the restrictive geographical requirements. It is land separated from the Continent of North America. But its narrow, watery divide is the East River—a river spanned by bridges and circumvented by tunnels which connect Long Island and its more than four and one-half million people to the mainland of America. So incidental and insignificant is the actual separation that part of the city of Greater New York is on one side of the bisecting river and part on the other, and neither Government nor taxes take cognizance thereof.

The area of Long Island is about that of the State of Rhode Island, though it outnumbers the combined population of the States of Nevada, Wyoming, Vermont, Utah, South Dakota, North Dakota, New Mexico, New Hampshire, Idaho, and Arizona, and in assessment valuation a combination of 13 other States. Long Island is 120 miles long and it constitutes practically all of New York State's salt-water front. It is a seashore resort, with ocean, sound, and inland bays. It contains one-half the City of New York with its theaters, museums, and varied other attractions. It draws people from all parts of the globe.

Thus, it is understandably attractive to scientists who do not wish to pursue their absorbing studies in some spot where inaccessibility might deprive them of ready enjoyment of these delights. Further, the scientists, though admitting the foregoing in part, say that in choosing a site on Long Island, they are influenced by a need to be near great metropolitan laboratories. I say boats and planes and old-fashioned correspondence may well be made the servants of researchers in their quest for answers and the interchange of knowledge. I further say that, sympathetic as I am to the

very natural inclinations of young and very human scientists, I do not believe this wish of theirs should be the final determinant.

The concern over the proposed establishment of a laboratory on Long Island is widespread among the dairymen of New York State. Their livestock alone is valued at a quarter of a billion dollars and their annual dairy production approximates this figure. The State commissioner of agriculture, C. Chester DuMond, has gone on record publicly as being wholly opposed to a laboratory in the State of New York if the dairymen are adverse to it. They are adamantly opposed. Protest against it has been unequivocal, strong, and vocative. Public meetings have expressed unanimous disapproval. The Suffolk County Board of Supervisors, Suffolk's governing body, by official resolution has declared against the use of any land for such a purpose.

Commissioner Robert Moses, president of the Long Island State Park Commission, and chairman of the New York State Council of Parks, has entered his strongest objections to Camp Hero because it is only a few miles distant from Hither Hills Park, frequented by thousands during the summer season. This park, Camp Hero, and the village of East Hampton all are within the confines of the old township of East Hampton, settled some 300 years ago. The village of East Hampton is one of the most beautiful in the country, with its shapely elms, its white cottages and white-painted fences, its green sward and historic graveyard with the headstone of the minister, by his own request, facing the tombstones of his parishoners. In this environment still stands the Home, Sweet Home immortalized by John Howard Payne, who would surely turn in his grave if this Congress permitted a noisome pest house hard by.

For these and many other reasons that I could give were time allowed I earnestly seek your support of my amendment, which is the insertion of the following words directly following the word "navigation" on the eleventh line of the second page of Dr. GILLIE's bill "and which shall not be connected with the mainland by tunnels."

Mr. HALE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MACY. I yield.

Mr. HALE. So far as the language of this bill is concerned, Manhattan Island itself would qualify, would it not?

Mr. MACY. The gentleman is entirely correct.

Mr. MacKINNON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MACY. I yield.

Mr. MacKINNON. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman is discussing a very fundamental point in Federal-State relations. It was the original intent of the framers of our Constitution that the States would exercise a veto power over the acquisition of lands within their borders for Federal purposes. Article 1, section 8, clause 17 of the United States Constitution provides that the consent of the legislature of each individual State was necessary before lands within a State could be acquired or used for Federal purposes. The

pertinent part of the United States Constitution above referred to gave the Congress authority to exercise exclusive jurisdiction only "over all places purchased by the consent of the legislature of the State in which the same shall be, for the erection of forts, magazines, and arsenals, dockyards, and other needful buildings."

In New York State, the United States is only authorized to acquire land when it is authorized under the laws of the State of New York. This is borne out by section 36, McKinney's Consolidated Laws of New York Annotated, book 56, State law, which reads as follows:

When the United States shall have been authorized by law to acquire title to any real property within this State, such title may be acquired by gift or grant from the owner thereof, or by condemnation if, for any reason, the United States is unable to agree with the owner for the purchase thereof.

To what extent has the State of New York given consent to the United States Government to purchase and acquire land within its borders? This question is answered in section 50, McKinney's Consolidated Laws of New York, book 56, State law. Because of the interest of the gentleman in this particular subject I include the pertinent language of that section:

SEC. 50. 1. The consent of the State of New York is hereby given to the purchase by the Government of the United States, and under the authority of the same, of any tract, piece or parcel of land from any individual or individuals, bodies politic or corporate within the boundaries of this State, for the purpose of parade or maneuver grounds, aviation fields, navy yards and naval stations, or for the purpose of erecting thereon light-houses, beacons, lighthouse keepers' dwellings, hospitals, sanatoriums, works for improving navigation, post-offices, custom houses, fortifications, or buildings and structures for the storage, manufacture or production of supplies, ordnance, apparatus or equipment of any kind whatsoever for the use of the Army or Navy, and any other needful buildings and structures.

2. In addition to the consent to purchase given in subdivision one of this section, the consent of the State is hereby given to the acquisition by exchange, donation or otherwise by the Government of the United States, and under the authority of the same, of any tract, piece or parcel of land from any county, city, town or village within this State for the purpose of parade or maneuver grounds or aviation fields, and every such county, city, town or village is hereby authorized and empowered to sell, exchange, donate or otherwise dispose of such tract, piece or parcel of land to the United States for such purpose or purposes; and all deeds, conveyances, or other papers. * * * As amended L. 1922, c. 14; L. 1941, c. 568, eff. April 19, 1941.

It is significant to me that the consent which the State of New York has given to the United States to acquire land within its borders has been restricted to land to be used for certain stated purposes. Even more significant is the fact that no consent has been given by the State of New York to the United States to acquire or use any land within its borders for an experimental laboratory dealing with the hoof-and-mouth disease.

I feel very strongly that it is necessary for us to do experimental work in connection with this very dangerous disease, but I do not believe it is desirable or

necessary that the Federal Government place a laboratory in a State contrary to the wishes of the inhabitants. Likewise I do not feel that the Federal Government should place the laboratory in a State where they have no authority to place it.

It seems clear to me that the State of New York has not consented to the establishment of such a United States laboratory within its borders. Likewise it seems abundantly clear that the consent which the State of New York has given for the acquiring of lands for the specifically stated purposes of military and navigation installations and the other specific purposes authorized and designated does not include consent to convert land acquired for such purposes as specified and authorized for purposes unspecified and unauthorized. If such were the case then the designation of specific purposes would be meaningless.

Let us support the gentleman from New York in his position, and if he is unsuccessful, I merely wish to point out to him that he may have additional support in the laws of his own State to prevent conversion of military property to a purpose which was not authorized by the New York Legislature.

I am sure that many States in the Union would welcome the laboratory in question. Let us establish this laboratory where some person desires it and not place it where it is not wanted.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose and the Speaker having resumed the Chair, Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 5098) to enable the Secretary of Agriculture to conduct research on foot-and-mouth disease and other diseases of animals and to amend the act of May 20, 1884 (23 Stat. 31), as amended, by adding another section, had come to no resolution thereon.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

FEDERAL EMPLOYEES NEED A LIVING WAGE

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, the fact that many different bills favoring a pay increase for United States Government workers have been introduced is evidence that the sentiment in Congress is for such an adjustment.

The sums mentioned range from \$468 to \$1,000 per year.

And the conditions vary from a cost-of-living bonus to a permanent increase.

After sifting through the mass of testimony which supports the case, I believe that we should legislate an \$800 per year increase for Federal workers and make such an increase permanent.

Government workers cannot strike. For "collective bargaining" they must

DIGEST OF
CONGRESSIONAL PROCEEDINGS
OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND FINANCE
Division of Legislative Reports
(For Department staff only)

Issued April 9, 1948
For actions of April 8, 1948
80th-2nd, No. 65

CONTENTS

Adjournment.....7,19	Foreign affairs.....20	Prices, control.....6
Agricultural commodities..10	Relief.....10,24	Remount service.....1
Alcohol.....18	Housing.....4	Research
Appropriations.....2,27	Labor.....25	Animal industry....13,22
Banking and currency.....5	Lands.....9	Roads.....14
Bankruptcy, farm.....8	Lands, reclamation....12,21	Statistics.....26
Corporations.....15	Livestock and	Taxation.....17
Dairy industry.....17	meat.....6,11,13,22	Territories and pos-
Farm program.....6	Marketing.....6	sessions.....15
Federal aid.....14	Oleomargarine.....17	Trade, foreign.....5
Flood control.....16	Personnel.....3,20	Transportation.....23

HIGHLIGHTS: Senate passed Remount Service bill; rejected Thomas motion and amendment. House passed foot-and-mouth disease research bill; agreed to amendment to prevent laboratory on Long Island. Congressional action completed on independent offices appropriation bill. Senate committees reported Federal pay bill and amendments to housing bill. House debated road authorizations bill.

SENATE

1. REMOUNT SERVICE. Passed with amendments H. R. 3484, to transfer the Remount Service to USDA (pp. 4327-44, 4349-52). Rejected the Thomas motion to refer the bill to the Agriculture and Forestry Committee, 23-44 (pp. 4350-1). Rejected, 15-43, the Thomas amendment (see Digest 64)(p. 4352).
2. INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATION BILL. Both Houses agreed to the conference report on this bill, H. R. 5214, and acted on amendments reported in disagreement (pp. 4344-9, 4361). This bill will now be sent to the President.
3. PAY INCREASES. The Post Office and Civil Service Committee reported with amendments S. 1537, to increase the rate of compensation of Government officials and employees (S. Rept. 1113)(p. 4325).
4. HOUSING. The Banking and Currency Committee reported various amendments to S. 866, the Taft-Elliender-Wagner housing bill (S. Rept. 140, pt. 2)(p. 4325).
5. EXPORT-IMPORT BANK. Received the President's message recommending a \$500 million increase in the lending authority of this Bank; to Banking and Currency Committee (p. 4352).
6. FARM PROGRAM. Sen. Capper inserted resolutions of the Corn Belt Livestock Feeders' Association recommending that USDA discontinue "unauthorized activities," opposing price controls, favoring a vigorous campaign against foot-and-mouth disease and Bang's disease, and expressing appreciation to central public markets (p. 4325).

7. RECESSED until Mon., Apr. 12 (p. 4356). The calendar is to be called at that time.
8. FARM BANKRUPTCY. In reporting H.R. 4326 (see Digest 63) the Judiciary Committee amended the bill to continue Sec. 75 of the Bankruptcy Act until Mar. 1, 1949. The committee report states, in part: "At the present time there may be no immediate need for this temporary extension of the benefits under said act, yet there is some evidence of such need and further need might arise without much warning. It is deemed advisable that the privileges conferred by this legislation be made effective. The passage of this admittedly temporary legislation should not be permitted to delay or interfere with the early consideration of legislation of a permanent nature to take the place of presently existing temporary section 75..."
9. C & C LANDS. In reporting S. 580 (see Digest 63) the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee included the following statement in its report: "The committee carefully considered all phases of the matter and is of the opinion (1) that the lands should be distributed exactly as they would have been had the lands been patented prior to revestment. The bill as reported does this."
10. FOREIGN AID. In reporting S. 2376 (see Digest 63), which provides for a revolving fund for purchase of agricultural commodities to be processed in occupied areas and sold, the Agriculture and Forestry Committee made the following changes in the bill: Struck out the authorization for an appropriation of \$150,000,000 as a revolving fund and inserted a direction that the Treasury lend up to that amount to the Army for establishment of the fund; deleted hide from the list of agricultural commodities to be purchased; added a provision that, in the case of wool, mohair, and flax fiber, only those types and grades shall be purchased which are designated to be available for export by the Secretary of Agriculture, and that stocks of such types and grades held by CCC shall be purchased before other purchases are made of such types and grades; redefined an occupied area to include liberated areas occupied by U.S. forces as well as occupied areas which are occupied jointly with other Allied Powers; added a provision that goods processed from the raw materials can be sold for currencies other than U.S. dollars, but that such receipts in an amount equal to the amount expended, plus interest, must be converted to U.S. dollars and returned to the fund; and inserted authorization for Congress (as well as the President) to terminate the program.
11. MEAT INSPECTION. In reporting S. 2256, to provide for meat inspection at Federal expense (see Digest 64), the Agriculture and Forestry Committee added a provision for continuation of the act of 1919 under which packers paid for overtime services.
12. APPROPRIATIONS. Received from the President (Apr. 6) a 1948 supplemental appropriation estimate of \$3,000,000 for the Colorado-Big Thompson Project, Colo. (S. Doc. 141).

HOUSE

13. FOOT-AND-MOUTH DISEASE RESEARCH. Passed with amendments H.R. 5098, to enable USDA to conduct research on foot-and-mouth disease in the U.S. (pp. 4361-7).
Agreed to the Committee amendment to prohibit the introduction of the live virus into the Mainland of the U.S., except coastal islands separated by waters navigable for deep-water navigation (p. 4366).
Agreed, 71-43, to an amendment by Rep. Macy, N.Y., designed to prevent the erection of a laboratory on Long Island, N.Y. (pp. 4361-5).

Rejected, 19-25, an amendment by Rep. Anderson, Calif., to provide that a research laboratory shall not be established in any State unless the Governor gives his approval (p. 4365), and rejected, 16-31, an amendment by Rep. Buck, N.Y., to provide that the laboratory be located on an island separated by one-half mile of navigable water (pp. 4365-6).

S. 2038, a similar Senate bill was then passed with the language of H.R. 5098 inserted as an amendment. (pp. 4366-7).

14. **ROADS; FEDERAL AID.** Agreed to a resolution for the consideration of H.R. 5888, to authorize appropriations for continuing highway construction under the Federal-Aid Road Act. (pp. 4368-75). Majority Leader Hallock announced that the bill will be debated on Mon., Apr. 12 (p. 4370).
15. **VIRGIN ISLANDS CORPORATION.** The Public Lands Committee reported with amendments H.R. 5904, to incorporate the Virgin Islands Corporation (H.Rept. 1699) (p. 4379).
16. **FLOOD CONTROL.** Rep. E.A. Hall, N.Y., spoke in favor of flood control works on the Susquehanna River in N.Y. (pp. 4375-8).
17. **OLEOMARGARINE.** Rep. Gross, Miss., compared the purity of oleomargarine and butter (p. 4358).
Rep. Foote, Conn., urged the repeal of taxes on oleomargarine (p. 4360).
18. **ALCOHOL PLANTS.** In reporting H.R. 6096 (see Digest 63) the Agriculture Committee struck out the authorization for the Department to sell the plants. The committee report states, in part: "The committee concurs in the request of the Secretary of Agriculture for transfer of the Muscatine plant to the Department of Agriculture. It believes, however, that the reasons advanced for retaining ownership of that plant in the Department apply with equal validity to the Kansas City and Omaha plants..."
19. **ADJOURNED** until Mon., Apr. 12 (p. 4378).

BILLS INTRODUCED

20. **PERSONNEL.** S. 2470, by Sen. Martin, Pa., to grant time to employees in the executive branch of the Government to participate, without loss of pay or deduction from annual leave, in funerals for deceased members of the armed forces returned to the U.S. for burial. To Post Office and Civil Service Committee. (p. 4325.)
S. 2474, by Sen. Vandenberg, Mich., to authorize the furnishing of services and the temporary detail of U.S. employees to public international organizations. To Foreign Relations Committee. (p. 4325.)
21. **RECLAMATION.** S. 2473, by Sen. McCarran, Nev., to provide for the allocation of the cost of Davis Dam and Davis Dam Reservoir. To Interior and Insular Affairs Committee. (p. 4325.)

ITEMS IN APPENDIX

22. **FOOT-AND-MOUTH DISEASE RESEARCH.** Speech in the House by Rep. Worley, Tex., discussing with other Members means of eradicating the foot-and-mouth disease and inserting Tex. cattlemen's resolutions on the subject (pp. A2277-82).
23. **ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY.** Extension of remarks of Rep. Andersen, Minn., favoring this project and including a newspaper editorial on the subject (p. A2285).

24. FOREIGN AID. Rep. Eaton, N.J.; inserted a statement on the details of administration of the Economic Cooperation Administration (pp. A2290-1).
25. LABOR. Rep. Tollefson, Wash., inserted informational statements on H.R. 4708, to provide for a labor extension service (pp. A2297-9).

BILL APPROVED BY THE PRESIDENT

26. TRADE STATISTICS. H.R. 3229 repeals the Act of Apr. 29, 1902, providing for procurement of statistics of trade between the U.S. and its noncontiguous territory. Approved Apr. 7 (Public Law 476, 80th Cong.).

COMMITTEE HEARING Released by G.P.O.

27. ARMY DEPARTMENT CIVIL FUNCTIONS APPROPRIATION BILL, 1949. H.R. 5524. Senate Appropriations Committee.

- o -

COMMITTEE HEARINGS ANNOUNCEMENTS for Apr. 9: H. Agriculture, permit banks for cooperatives to convert to farmer ownership (Duggan and Wells, FCA, to testify); H. Public Works, flood-control omnibus bill; H. Veterans' Affairs, veterans' homesteads; H. Armed Services, permit use of oleomargarine by armed forces; S. Appropriations, Treasury-Post Office and first deficiency appropriations; S. Armed Services, UMT (ex.); H. Appropriations, deficiency, Interior, and Military Establishments appropriations (ex.); H. Public Lands, add lands to T. Roosevelt Nat'l. Mon. Park, N.Dak., and Reclamation Act amendments. For Apr. 13: H. Agriculture, fertilizer research.

- o -

For supplemental information and copies of legislative material referred to, call Ext. 4654 or send to Room 113 Adm. Arrangements may be made to be kept advised, routinely, of developments on any particular bill.

- oOo -

sustained as a result of an accident involving a United States Veterans' Administration fire truck near the main gate of the Bay Pines Veterans' Administration Hospital, on November 26, 1943.

The Senate amended the bill by striking from it the names and appropriation of Grace M. Collins and Guy B. Slater. The recommendation of the committee of conference is that the Senate recede from its amendments and the House agree to the same.

JOHN JENNINGS, Jr.,
CLIFFORD P. CASE,
FADJO CRAVENS,

Managers on the Part of the House.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. STOCKMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may address the House for 1 hour on Monday next after the disposition of business on the Speaker's desk and the conclusion of special orders heretofore granted.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SADLAK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a radio address by Ann Su Cardwell.

INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATION BILL, 1949—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 5214) making appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes; and I ask unanimous consent that the statement may be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WIGGLESWORTH]?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

(For conference report and statement, see proceedings of the House, April 7, 1948.)

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the first amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 1, page 3, line 1, insert the following: "For additional personal services for the White House Office to meet emergencies that may arise, \$200,000."

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur with an amendment.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the motion of the gentleman from Massachusetts.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1 and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In line 2 of said amendment, after the word "arise," insert the following: "Without regard to the provisions of law regulating the employment and compensation of persons in the Government service."

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 13, on page 22, line 11, insert the following:

"Geophysical Institute, Alaska: For the establishment of a geophysical institute at the University of Alaska, as authorized by the act of July 31, 1946 (48 U. S. C. 175, 175a), \$100,000, to be immediately available and to remain available until expended, and in addition thereto the Public Buildings Administration is authorized to enter into contracts for this purpose in an amount not exceeding \$875,000: *Provided*, That no part of this appropriation shall become available unless and until title to the land upon which said institute is to be constructed shall have been conveyed to the United States: *Provided further*, That, notwithstanding the provision of any other law, all buildings and equipment constructed or acquired with funds herein appropriated or under authority to contract shall, upon the establishment of the institute, be the property of the United States."

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the amendment of the Senate numbered 13.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 17: page 27, line 18, "Testing and research laboratory: For continuing the construction of a laboratory, on a site already acquired, for permanent quarters for the testing and research work of the Public Roads Administration, \$1,000,000, to remain available until expended."

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 17, and concur in the same.

The motion was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider the votes on which action was taken on the several motions was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. RICH asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.

Mr. BENDER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in four different instances and in each to include newspaper articles.

Mr. HEBERT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an editorial from the New Orleans States.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and to include a letter.

Mr. MCGREGOR and Mr. DONDERO asked and were given permission to revise and extend the remarks they expect to make in the Committee of the Whole this afternoon.

Mr. ANGELL asked and was given permission to extend the remarks he expects to make in the Committee of the Whole this afternoon and include excerpts.

AUTHORIZING RESEARCH ON FOOT-AND-MOUTH DISEASE

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 5098) to enable the Sec-

retary of Agriculture to conduct research on foot-and-mouth disease and other diseases of animals and amend the act of May 29, 1884 (23 Stat. 31), as amended, by adding another section.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 5098, with Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee rose on yesterday, April 7, there was pending the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. MACY] to the committee amendment.

Without objection, the Clerk will again read the amendment of the gentleman from New York.

There being no objection, the Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MACY: On page 2, line 11, after the word "navigation", insert: "and which shall not be connected with the mainland by any tunnel."

Mr. FULLER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, after a long and careful study of the situation as a member of the Agriculture Committee, I am very much in favor of the legislation before the House today. Unless this bill is enacted into law, our meat supply is gravely threatened, as well as the health and prosperity of the American people.

However, the question has arisen as to where the laboratories to study this terrible hoof-and-mouth disease should be located, and I am very much opposed to their being located in the populous Long Island area as recommended by the experts of the Department of Agriculture.

I am afraid that if the bill is enacted as it now stands, that Long Island will be the site selected. The people of that area are bitterly opposed to it for a number of very good reasons. These reasons have been presented to the members of the House in a most excellent brief prepared by the able and distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. MACY], in whose district it is proposed to place this experimental station.

From every common-sense standpoint, this station should not be located on Long Island.

At this point I yield to my very dear friend and colleague, the gentleman from New York [Mr. MACY], and am pleased to second in advance his remarks and recommendations.

Mr. MACY. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from New York. This situation was discussed very fully yesterday and I do not want to intrude on your time today except to emphasize the point that New York City has never been considered by any one as not being a part of the mainland of the United States. Half of New York City is on Long Island. So when they consider Long Island as an island within the meaning of the House provision, it seems to me it is a very, very strained construction. Yet when I talked with the professors from the Department of Agriculture there was no question in their minds but what it would be located there and that is why I am before you today.

They do not know yet whether this virus is air-borne or not, they do not know of any way of correcting it; therefore it should not be imported into the United States of America. You have a very violent disease raging on our southern boundary and it seems to me the place to fight it is down there where the ingredients of the disease are located. That is the place to fight it. When we were fighting the Nazis, General Eisenhower did not bring them over here to fight them and when MacArthur was fighting the Japs he did not bring them over to the United States to fight them. You go where the operations are located.

If this is a conflagration down there you do not want to sit up here and fight it and build a \$30,000,000 laboratory, which will take 3 or 4 years to build anyway. I say everything should be done to stamp out this disease and to protect us right where the disease is.

The distinguished chairman of the Committee on Public Works had a little piece the other day in the *RECORD* about a Mr. Wheeler. We do not know exactly who he is, or who these professional people are we are going to get. He made some remarks on that matter and was taken to task very heavily. We find that same professor turned up in Prague teaching with the approval of the Communists, apparently. So I think with the atom bomb situation on Long Island and with a great number of scientists there, we have our full share of Federal Government largesse and we can very well dispense with this added hoof-and-mouth hospital.

I hope the Members of the Congress will amend this bill in the moderate way I have asked that it be amended in order that we shall not have this threatened alarm down at the east end of my district. The chairman of the Agricultural Committee detailed the population of that community yesterday. May I say that in East Hampton Township you have one of the great parks of the State of New York to which thousands of people come every summer. I think that John Howard Payne would turn over in his grave if there were established there near Home, Sweet Home this so-called hospital, all protected in the manner in which it is protected, showing the danger of the disease.

Mr. Chairman, I therefore hope my amendment will prevail.

Mrs. LUSK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I want to speak in behalf of this committee which has labored so diligently in the preparation of this bill. I think they have given more study and thought to the need for research into the foot-and-mouth disease than any other Members of the House, and I feel that we should follow their recommendation. In my opinion the amendment is not necessary. There are several reasons for this. I think we can safely trust our modern scientists to take care of any precautions necessary to prevent infection in this country, and we should also leave it to their judgment to select the area best suited from all standpoints for the study of this infection. The important thing in my mind is to get something under way that will develop the virus

needed for the protection of our livestock. I think it is too bad that we have delayed so long in making some preparation to combat this disease other than by trying to keep it from crossing our boundaries. We cannot always look forward to the protection of our livestock in that manner. We must be prepared to fight the disease with vaccine.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentlewoman from New Mexico has expired.

(Mrs. LUSK and Mr. HOEVEN asked and were given permission to revise and extend their remarks.)

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman, I doubt whether there is any necessity of going into details relating to the foot-and-mouth disease. We all know that something must be done to keep it out of this country. When this bill was considered in committee I was inclined to be a bit sympathetic with the efforts of the gentleman from New York [Mr. MACY] to prevent the location of a research laboratory on Long Island. But, in giving this matter very careful study I have come to the conclusion that the great need for something to be done right now transcends any quibbling or argument about the location of any particular laboratory. I need not remind those of you from our agricultural and livestock States of the consequences which will result if the foot-and-mouth disease spreads from Mexico into the United States.

There is nothing in this bill that says that a laboratory shall be established on Long Island. I am also quite sure that the able New York delegation, with its power and influence here in the Congress, and with the great State of New York supporting its position, is not going to permit the erection of a laboratory on Long Island if it is against the best interests of the people of New York State. We must not forget that the interests of all the people of the United States are involved here; including the great cattle industry, and the interest of agriculture in general. So, in my humble judgment, I believe it would be best to leave this matter of selecting sites for laboratories to the Department of Agriculture. Personally, I would have preferred building a laboratory on some island in the Atlantic Ocean far removed from the mainland, but that did not seem practicable to the committee. We must leave this authority somewhere, and as far as I am concerned I think that the Department of Agriculture will do its best to locate these laboratories where they will be able to perform research work to the best advantage. I sincerely trust that the work of the subcommittee, headed by my colleague the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. GILLIE] is being duly appreciated. I know of no subcommittee of the Committee on Agriculture that has done a more thorough piece of work. They are entitled to your support. I favor the bill and am opposed to the amendment which would restrict the location of the laboratories. We must get busy with the research work while there is yet time.

Mr. WORLEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I endorse 100 percent the remarks of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HOEVEN]. The foot-and-mouth subcommittee of the Committee on Agriculture held hearings for weeks; in fact, it held hearings for months on the whole question of the foot-and-mouth disease in Mexico and what we in the United States, can do to eradicate it down there, and prevent its spread to our country. It has been a losing fight from the beginning in Mexico. It is simply a question of whether we are going to be prepared to fight the disease if it should get across the border.

This is not a local problem by any means. Everybody, I think, realizes just what the shock to our economy would be if this disease were to escape. We simply have our choice of being prepared or not. This is just as much a war as the war from which we have just emerged although a war of a different type. Of course, I would naturally prefer that we take our technicians and our scientists to Mexico and set up a laboratory there and conduct the experiments right there on the spot, but I think almost everybody knows that it would be far more desirable for this country to have the laboratory located where we would have full, complete, and unquestioned control, where the climatic conditions where we would develop a vaccine would be the same as they would where the disease might break out, and where the scientists themselves would be close to research centers that could take advantage of the data the scientists of the metropolitan areas and the universities have already developed. I also believe we should conduct research in Mexico as well.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WORLEY. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. May I ask the gentleman if he knows of any instance where the foot-and-mouth disease has broken out north of the fiftieth degree of latitude?

Mr. WORLEY. I know of no instance in which the disease has broken out above the present quarantine line, and I hope that it does not. In a research laboratory the United States technicians and scientists will certainly use every safeguard possible to keep the disease confined.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. The reason I asked that question is that there are many of us up in the North who are afraid the disease might get started in some of the dairy sections.

Mr. WORLEY. The disease could hit New York just as quickly as it could hit Texas. This bill does not in any shape, fashion, or form designate Long Island as the site for the research laboratory. It simply provides that wherever the laboratory is placed it shall be separated from the mainland by deep water navigation. I am willing to leave the location of this laboratory to the technicians and the scientists who have spent their lives studying the question. I am not qualified to say where the laboratory should be placed and I doubt that any Member of the House is sufficiently well qualified to do so, with the exception perhaps of the gentleman from Indiana,

Dr. GILLIE, who is himself a veterinarian and who is supporting this bill.

Mr. LYLE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WORLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. LYLE. It would be impractical for the Members of this House to try to select or limit the site other than to say that it shall be within the continental limits of the United States, would it not?

Mr. WORLEY. Nobody in the House felt qualified to locate the sites of the atomic energy research program. The qualified experts selected the sites, not Congress.

Mr. LYLE. As a matter of fact, your committee has been particularly careful about writing this bill so that it would not make the United States vulnerable to an invasion of the disease.

Mr. WORLEY. That is right. This legislation is simply looking down the road. If we are going to develop a cure for the foot-and-mouth disease, we have to do it by research and the quicker we get started the better.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WORLEY. I yield.

Mr. HARRIS. The gentleman has heard testimony in connection with this very important piece of legislation. It seems to me the issue is as to whether or not this research program would be located in Long Island. In the testimony before the gentleman's committee, were there alternative locations pointed out for the establishment of such a laboratory and program?

Mr. WORLEY. Yes. The committee considered such sites as Puerto Rico and islands in Hawaii and many other locations suggested. The committee went into that question quite carefully and thoroughly.

Mr. Chairman, I trust the committee will not support this amendment, and tie the hands of these best qualified to select a suitable island site.

Mr. GILLIE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. As far as I am concerned, we do not want any amendments in this bill. If we are going to amend this bill, we might just as well not pass it. The scientists who have charge of this kind of work should be able to select the place where they are going to put this laboratory. I cannot understand for the life of me why the people from Long Island are so worried about this laboratory being placed on Long Island. There were several places, as you know by this time, that were looked at. Long Island happened to be one of them. There were some places down along the coast. Of course the people up in Long Island found out that they were up there looking at this spot and that is what stirred up this whole mess. There is no need of all this going on now because if the people of Long Island did not want it there, that would end it. We do not know where they are going to put the laboratory. It is going to be built on an island if one can be found. I would like to say in connection with some remarks that my colleague the gentleman from New York [Mr. EDWIN

ARTHUR HALL] made yesterday concerning these scientists when he said that they ought to be willing to go to the Sahara Desert or Timbuktu and a couple of other places if they were working for the Government. These scientists are collaborators and are not paid by the Government. These men are brought into this work with no pay whatsoever. They are not even paid one penny. That is the reason we would like to have this laboratory close to a big metropolitan center so that we can draw on good scientists.

Mr. MACY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GILLIE. I yield.

Mr. MACY. You remember very well in your office when you were gracious enough to bring the five scientists from the Department of Agriculture in? Was there any doubt in your mind as a result of the conversation then that they were going to locate this laboratory on Long Island and that that was their first choice?

Mr. GILLIE. That was one of the places they looked at, yes.

Mr. MACY. Therefore all the discussion about the laboratory possibly not going on Long Island means nothing if this bill is adopted. In view of the fact that the Representative from that district was not consulted in advance and that the decision was a predetermined one, I think that this amendment should be adopted.

Mr. GILLIE. As I said before, one reason why they want this laboratory close to a metropolitan center is so that they will be able to draw on the scientists to be found in those areas. If it is put away in some other spot in the United States far from these large centers, they are going to have trouble in getting scientists to go there and help them in this work. As the gentleman from Texas [Mr. WORLEY] has so well said this morning, you must not forget that this is a war that we have on our hands right now. Just as sure as we are standing here today, we are going to have trouble with this foot-and-mouth disease, and we might as well be getting ready and get this laboratory built. It is only 300 miles away from our border now. It is much more important to try to get this disease licked than to be paying so much attention to where the laboratory will be built.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GILLIE. I yield.

Mr. RICH. The fact of the matter is we have given \$36,000,000 to try to keep it away from our borders in Mexico during last year. If that disease is as bad as the Department of Agriculture says it is, we ought to keep it just as far away from our American shores as we possibly can. If we cannot get our scientists to go to the disease, we ought to be very careful in bringing the disease close to the thickly inhabited parts of our country. I want economy in Government, but it is money well spent if we pay some of these scientists, if necessary, to go there in order to keep this thing away from our shores. That would be money well spent.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. GILLIE] has expired.

Mr. LEONARD W. HALL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I listened to the remarks of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. GILLIE]. I gained the impression from what he said that the site for this laboratory has not been fixed. As a matter of fact, the gentleman from New York [Mr. MACY] and I met with the scientists in Mr. GILLIE's office, and if this bill is passed as it is, those scientists are going to put this laboratory on Long Island. So we are talking about a bill which is in general terms, but the area for this laboratory has been determined before this House has been asked to pass upon this bill.

I say this bill is not honest when it makes some difference between the area on Long Island and the mainland of the United States. To think that a committee brought in a bill which provides that you cannot put this laboratory on the mainland but you can put it on Long Island, where today we have better than 4,000,000 people, is impossible to understand. They put it next to our seashores where hundreds of thousands of people bathe each day. They put it in an area where much of our money has been spent for State parks for the benefit of the people. But there is another point involved in this question. During the war and before the war our people were willing to give up areas of land in all sections for defense purposes—for factories, forts, and so forth. Are we now going to find out that after the Government has taken land for defense purposes they can come in and put anything on that land that the Government desires to put on it, irrespective of the type of area, irrespective of the zoning regulations of the area involved?

I think we have heard enough about this bill, but I think, in all fairness, we should not be discussing what appears to be a general bill, with members of the committee telling Members of this House that this laboratory may go to any island in the United States, when I think, if the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. GILLIE] will just tell us about the meeting they had in his office, he will have to admit that Long Island has been picked as the spot for this laboratory.

Mr. Chairman, there is no difference in the world between Long Island and the mainland of the United States.

Mr. GILLIE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEONARD W. HALL. I yield.

Mr. GILLIE. That, of course, was just one of the places discussed. There were several places mentioned, as I said before.

Mr. LEONARD W. HALL. Did not the gentleman arrange a meeting in his office for the gentleman from New York [Mr. MACY] and me to meet the scientists? And did not the scientists say that if they had their way this laboratory would go on Long Island?

Mr. GILLIE. Yes; but they are not the whole group.

Mr. LEONARD W. HALL. Did they not say that in the gentleman's office?

Mr. GILLIE. I do not remember that.

Mr. LEONARD W. HALL. I remember it very well.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. LEONARD W. HALL. I yield.

Mr. TABER. Is it not important that when we consider the location of this laboratory we take into consideration the question of the spread of the disease, as well as its prevention? And does not this amendment tend to help limit the spread of the disease?

Mr. LEONARD W. HALL. I do not know enough about the disease to say, but I cannot understand why, if this disease is not dangerous, the gentleman from Indiana sees to it that the laboratory cannot go in his State. He thinks it is all right, however, for it to go on Long Island.

Mr. GILLIE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEONARD W. HALL. I yield.

Mr. GILLIE. The gentleman knows that if he does not want it there it will not go there. How could this scientific council build it there if the people of Long Island did not want it there? How could they do it?

Mr. LEONARD W. HALL. I repeat to the gentleman from Indiana that at a meeting called by him the scientists told us this laboratory was going on Long Island if they had anything to say about it.

Mr. GILLIE. Another thing, if you want to stop it, you can stop it when it comes before the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEONARD W. HALL. I yield.

Mr. REED of New York. Is it not a fact that if they locate this laboratory on Long Island it is going to affect adversely the value of all property on Long Island?

Mr. LEONARD W. HALL. The site of the laboratory is in the best residential area of Long Island. Not only that, it is also next to Jones' Beach. Everyone who is familiar with Long Island knows that it is the greatest bathing beach not only in New York but in the entire world.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. POTTS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York may proceed for two additional minutes. I wish to ask him some questions.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. POTTS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEONARD W. HALL. I yield.

Mr. POTTS. This area where the laboratory is to be set up—and I will accept the gentleman's comment on what has been decided—is but a few short miles across Long Island Sound from the mainland of Connecticut, Massachusetts, and all those New England States which have substantial cattle interests that could also be affected if this virus were transported by means of ferries or otherwise from the tip of Long Island to the mainland itself. Is not that so?

Mr. LEONARD W. HALL. I would say that is so. I may say also that had they wanted to pick out a site in the greatest concentration of population in the United States they could not have picked any site which fits that definition better than the site now in the minds of the scientists, on Long Island.

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEONARD W. HALL. I yield.

Mr. LATHAM. I may call attention also to the fact that in the letter which the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture read to the House it was stated that they intended to dump the residue of these experiments into the waters of Long Island Sound.

Mr. LEONARD W. HALL. There is no question about that.

Mr. LATHAM. Used for bathing purposes by 20,000,000 people a year.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I would remind the membership that all these questions that were raised yesterday and have been raised today on this matter were thoroughly discussed, exhaustively discussed by the subcommittee which spent the better part of 4 or 5 weeks trying to work out a satisfactory solution to this problem. At the end of that time the subcommittee reported to the full committee and the full committee gave careful consideration to the matter and particular consideration to this problem of how limited we should make the location of this laboratory. After that was done, the gentleman from New York [Mr. MACY] requested the opportunity to come before the full committee and, although the committee had other very important business that day, it gave him the opportunity to appear before the committee to explain the situation of the people in his district. I may say that the committee was very sympathetic with the viewpoint which he presented; yet, after considering the matter from every possible angle, the committee did not feel it would be wise to further restrict the location of this laboratory.

Let me say that although it may appear now the tip end of Long Island is a suitable location for this laboratory, there has been no selection made of the site and I am positive from what I know of the general policy of the Department of Agriculture in locating installations of this kind that if there is serious opposition to its location at the point designated and discussed here, it will not be located there over that opposition.

Mr. Chairman, there is a lot of misapprehension here. It is quite possible that after the matter is thoroughly explained and discussed there will be no objection to the location of the laboratory on this designated site and for that reason I say let us not try to hamstring the Department today by saying the laboratory shall not be located on this particular site. Let us leave it open. I feel equally sure that if these objections persist and if they cannot be dissipated by a thorough discussion and understanding of the matter, the laboratory will not be located at that point. Let us not tie the hands of the Department in this most important matter because this

is an effort to repel an invasion. It is an effort in the national defense, because if we permit the foot-and-mouth disease to get into this country and are not prepared to handle it, then it will be a disaster that can only be compared with a military disaster.

Mr. MACY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. MACY. The question as the gentleman presents it makes it possible to go down on Long Island for this site and, although he says that they will explain it all, one of the explanations that brought this up was the amount of money that would be expended down there as a means of enticement for the people to be for it. That puts us in a very unfair position to argue down there with the local people. The gentleman just mentioned the tremendous expenditure of money as an argument. That is what I like to be defended against by this amendment.

Mr. GRANGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. I yield to the gentleman from Utah.

Mr. GRANGER. Certainly the site has not been determined upon. No appropriation has been made. And, as the gentleman has said, when all the facts are known, perhaps some of the Members will be after the location of a \$30,000,000 plant in their district rather than opposing it. This is the first time I have ever known of a Member of Congress opposing an installation of this kind in his district.

To make the RECORD clear on the remarks I made yesterday, Mr. Chairman, about the importation of infected cattle from infected areas, especially from Great Britain, it must be understood that those cattle before they came into the United States were quarantined in Canada. They were brought into this country after they had been quarantined in Canada and supervised.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kansas has expired.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last three words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the pending Macy amendment. It seems rather peculiar to me, bearing in mind the request just made by the distinguished chairman of the House Committee on Agriculture that we should not tie the hands of these scientists in picking a spot for this laboratory, that these scientists select a location on Long Island with a population of 4,250,000 to 5,000,000 people. It seems to me, with all the vast areas in the United States where this laboratory could be built, that there must be something behind the proposition of locating it on Long Island. Do the cattle folks who are the victims, so to speak, of the foot-and-mouth disease, come to us as Greeks bearing gifts in locating their laboratory up on Long Island in an area, as has been ably pointed out by the gentleman from New York [Mr. HALL] which is heavily populated and which is a veritable playground where people not only from Long Island, but from the entire metropolitan New York City, Connecti-

cut, New Jersey, and elsewhere go to bathe and to enjoy our beautiful park system. To even suggest the building of a laboratory such as this at such a spot looks to me like an instance of the Greeks bearing gifts. Mr. Chairman, this laboratory isn't wanted on Long Island. Let us proceed to a vote, which I trust will overwhelmingly sustain the amendment offered by the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. MACY].

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. MACY].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. HOPE) there were—ayes 71, noes 43.

So the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ANDERSON of California: On page 2, line 15, after the word "safeguards", insert "Provided, That such research laboratory shall not be established in any State unless the Governor of such State shall signify his approval."

The CHAIRMAN. May the Chair ask the gentleman, Is the amendment offered as an amendment to the committee amendment?

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Yes, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDERSON of California. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. GROSS. Where would the gentleman suggest that this laboratory be built?

Mr. ANDERSON of California. I have no suggestion, but I will point out to the gentleman that I hope we will comply with the provisions of the Constitution and let the Governor of any State wherein this laboratory might be located give it his approval if he desires to have it there. We find ourselves today in a very unique position. I think in my 10 years in Congress this is the first time that I have seen a Federal project involving the expenditure of as much money as is involved here rejected by practically every Member of Congress and every State of the Union. I realize the importance of passing this legislation, but I seek to amend it so that we comply with the provisions of the Constitution, as pointed out by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MacKINNON] yesterday. If you will refer to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, page 4304, you will find that he disgorged a rather learned mouthful in a brief period of time.

Florida, with all of its palm-fringed beaches and its really first-class oranges, does not want this project. Texas, with its vast prairies and its pink grapefruit, does not want the project. California, with its unequalled climate, its sun-kissed hills and valleys, and its prunes, does not want this project. I do not know of any State in the Union that does want it. I do not know whether Hawaii and Alaska have been consulted by the members of the committee or the BAL. The State of California Board of Agriculture recently met on this subject and passed a resolution, a provision of which I should like to read:

Now, therefore, be it resolved, That the California State Board of Agriculture in regular session at Sacramento, Calif., unanimously records its opposition to the importation into this country or adjacent islands of the virus of hoof-and-mouth disease for the purpose of experimentation therewith.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDERSON of California. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BENDER. The gentleman forgot to mention the fine pears that are grown in California.

Mr. ANDERSON of California. As the gentleman knows, I have a personal interest in the subject, and I modestly refrained from mentioning those pears.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDERSON of California. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RICH. It seems to me from the discussion that was had here this morning, since we are trying to locate this project at centers where we will get free gifts of scientific knowledge to this organization to try to keep this disease from our animals, that the cheapest thing this country can do, after you spent \$80,000,000 last year to eradicate it in Mexico, is to spend five, ten, fifteen, or twenty million dollars, if necessary, to hire men who are willing to try to find some way of killing this disease. That is the cheapest money we could spend. I have been for economy ever since I have been here, and I do not want to waste any more money now as we did down in Mexico, but I think we ought to hire some men and pay them to try to kill this disease before it gets into our country and into our livestock.

Mr. ANDERSON of California. It is so seldom that the gentleman from Pennsylvania stands on the floor and advocates the spending of money to hire anybody that I welcome his contribution and his suggestion.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDERSON of California. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HINSHAW. Why should not they place this laboratory in Brazil, from which this disease lately emanated?

Mr. ANDERSON of California. That might be a splendid suggestion.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be again reported.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

The Clerk again read the Anderson amendment.

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Chairman, the issue is clear. I hope the amendment will be supported.

Mr. WORLEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, it is very heartening to see new converts to the theory of States' rights. If this were a local problem instead of a national problem I think the amendment offered by the gentleman from California would be very appropriate and should be adopted. However, nowhere in the Constitution

do you find any provision which would prohibit the Congress from exercising its function of carrying on a fight against so dangerous a disease, an enemy which is just as real and just as dangerous as a wartime enemy. The Constitution of the Federal Government provides that the qualifications of electors shall be left to the States to decide, and that over questions like FEPC, the antilynch law, and matters of similar nature, the States themselves have full and complete control and jurisdiction, and I would like to see Congress honor and respect those constitutional provisions. But if the States themselves have any control or jurisdiction over Mexico, I do not know where it is. My own State of Texas has made ample appropriations to protect the border along the Rio Grande to keep the disease out, but she cannot fight this battle alone. As I say, if this were a local problem and if it were a problem that came strictly within the purview of the States, then I think the amendment offered by the gentleman from California ought to be adopted. But if you are in favor of a research program to help prevent an outbreak of the foot-and-mouth disease or to find a cure for it, I hardly see how you can honestly support the amendment offered by the gentleman.

Mr. ELLIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WORLEY. I yield.

Mr. ELLIS. What do you think would be the chances of reelection for the Governor of a State who would advocate the establishment of one of these laboratories in his State?

Mr. WORLEY. Politics being so uncertain today, I would hesitate to offer an opinion on that score.

But, Mr. Chairman, if the Committee wants to take a step to stop or retard the research program, the adoption of this amendment is one of the best and quickest ways to do that.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WORLEY. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN. In answer to the question asked by the gentleman from Ohio, this is not a bill to reelect some Governor, is it?

Mr. WORLEY. No, it is not; and I am sure the amendment is not intended for that purpose. But if this amendment is adopted, then you immediately subvert the proper functions of the Federal Government. I feel confident the States themselves want full and complete cooperation from the Federal Government. The dread foot-and-mouth virus recognizes no State lines or international boundaries.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. ANDERSON].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. PHILLIPS of California) there were—ayes 19, noes 25. So the amendment was rejected.

[Mr. KEEFE addressed the Committee. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BUCK: On page 2, line 10, after "by", insert "one-half mile of."

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Chairman, in accordance with the definition contained in this bill, this laboratory could be located on an island 30 feet from the mainland. If it is actually true that this deadly virus must be separated from the mainland by a substantial expanse of water to prevent its spread, let us assure by the terms of the bill that there must be such substantial expanse and not a mere 30, 40, or 50 feet.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUCK. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ROONEY. Under that definition, it would be possible to locate this laboratory on Staten Island.

Mr. BUCK. According to my amendment, it could not be put on Staten Island, because Staten Island is not a half mile from the mainland. As the bill is written, the laboratory could be put on Staten Island.

Mr. ROONEY. The question is whether or not there are any livestock on Staten Island.

Mr. BUCK. I am not particularly considering Staten Island. I am concerned with giving the protection that the expert testimony of the gentleman from Indiana and the gentleman from Texas showed should be put into effect. If we need the protection of water, let us have that protection.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUCK. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Has the gentleman given any consideration to the awful thing that might happen? Actually, this laboratory might be put on Blackwell's Island.

Mr. BUCK. It might be.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUCK. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. STEFAN. Has the gentleman conferred with the admiral of the Nebraska navy as to whether it could be put on Brady or Grand Islands?

Mr. BUCK. I have not.

Mr. GAMBLE. How about Coney Island?

Mr. BUCK. Coney Island is not an island.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. HOPE) there were—ayes 16, noes 31.

So the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee amendment as amended.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who may want to extend their remarks on this measure may do so at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. REES. Mr. Chairman, foot-and-mouth disease is the most infectious and contagious disease known in its effects on cattle and other cloven-hoof animals. When once it breaks out, it is almost uncontrollable. Those in livestock industry are continuously concerned about this dreadful disease. It cannot be cured. Up to this time no one has been able to discover a preventive. There have been outbreaks in this country a few times during the past several years. The only way found to deal with the malady was to destroy the animals infected, and do it immediately. I believe it is estimated that livestock valued at a quarter of a billion dollars were destroyed in the State of California alone, a few years ago on account of this disease.

Livestock operators in this country are deeply concerned right now because of the outbreak in Mexico that has spread to various parts of that country. This came about by reason of a shipment of infected cattle from Brazil to Mexico a year and a half ago. Our Government contributed about \$75,000,000 in an effort to help stamp out the disease in Mexico. Those who are familiar with the problem, tell me the situation in Mexico is very far from satisfactory. This, in spite of efforts of the Governments of Mexico and the United States to deal with the problem. The thing that makes the situation worse is that destruction of cattle is the destruction of food. Our Government is, I am sure, taking every precaution and effort to prevent the spread of the disease into this country.

It would be terrible to contemplate the disaster if this dread disease should become widespread in this country. It would not damage, and almost destroy, the second largest industry in the United States, but, worst of all, destroy a big segment of the food supply of our country. It would prevent our assistance in furnishing people of other countries in need of food. Mr. Chairman, I think it might be well to remind the people of this country that we have for years prohibited the importation of live cattle from South American countries, in an effort to protect the livestock industry in this country against this disease. There have been times when men engaged in the livestock industry have been criticized because they opposed the importation of cattle from South American countries. Hoof-and-mouth disease has prevailed in South American countries for many years. We are extremely fortunate not to have had more trouble with this malady.

This legislation is to provide for laboratory facilities in effort to develop vaccine, or some other means that may be found to prevent the spread of this disease. It will provide for a real scientific study of the problem. We hope modern science may discover a means of combating this dangerous malady.

Mr. Chairman, the authorization of the expenditure of these funds is of greatest importance. I do not believe anyone will oppose it.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 5098) to enable the Secretary of Agriculture to conduct research on foot-and-mouth disease and other diseases of animals and to amend the act of May 29, 1884 (23 Stat. 31), as amended, by adding another section, pursuant to House Resolution 491, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 2038) to enable the Secretary of Agriculture to conduct research on foot-and-mouth disease and other diseases of animals and to amend the act of May 29, 1884 (23 Stat. 31), as amended, by adding another section.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the act of May 29, 1884 (23 Stat. 31), as amended, is hereby amended by adding a new section 12, reading as follows:

"SEC. 12. The Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to establish research laboratories, including the acquisition of necessary land, buildings, or facilities, and also the making of research contracts under the authority contained in section 10 (a) of the Bankhead-Jones Act of 1935 as amended by the Research and Marketing Act of 1946, for research and study, in the United States or elsewhere, of foot-and-mouth disease and other animal diseases which, in the opinion of the Secretary, constitute a threat to the livestock industry of the United States: *Provided*, That no live virus of foot-and-mouth disease may be introduced for any purpose into any part of the mainland of the United States except coastal islands separated therefrom by waters navigable for deep-water navigation, and which shall not be connected with the mainland by any tunnel, and except further, that in the event of outbreak of foot-and-mouth disease in this country, the Secretary of Agriculture may, at his discretion, permit said virus to be brought into the United States under adequate safeguards. To carry out the provisions of this section, the Secretary is authorized to employ technical experts or scientists without regard to the Classification Act: *Provided*, That the number so employed shall not exceed five, and that the maximum compensation for each shall not exceed \$15,000 per annum. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as Congress may deem necessary; in addition, the Secretary is authorized to utilize, in carrying out this section, funds otherwise available for the control or eradication of such diseases."

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HOPE: Strike out all after the enacting clause of the bill S. 2038 and insert the provisions of H. R. 5098, as amended, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the act of May 29, 1884 (23 Stat. 31), as amended, is hereby amended by adding a new section 12 reading as follows:

"Sec. 12. The Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to establish research laboratories, including the acquisition of necessary land, buildings, or facilities, and also the making of research contracts under the authority contained in section 10 (a) of the Bankhead-Jones Act of 1935, as amended by the Research and Marketing Act of 1946, for research and study, in the United States or elsewhere, of foot-and-mouth disease and other animal diseases which in the opinion of the Secretary constitute a threat to the livestock industry of the United States: *Provided*, That no live virus of foot-and-mouth disease may be introduced for any purpose into any part of the mainland of the United States except coastal islands separated therefrom by waters navigable for deep-water navigation, and except further, that in the event of outbreak of foot-and-mouth disease in this country, the Secretary of Agriculture may, at his discretion, permit said virus to be brought into the United States under adequate safeguards. To carry out the provisions of this section the Secretary is authorized to employ technical experts or scientists without regard to the Classification Act: *Provided*, That the number so employed shall not exceed five and that the maximum compensation for each shall not exceed \$15,000 per annum. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as Congress may deem necessary; in addition, the Secretary is authorized to utilize, in carrying out this section, funds otherwise available for the control or eradication of such diseases."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar House bill (H. R. 5098) was laid on the table.

PRIVILEGE OF THE HOUSE

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a question of the privilege of the House and ask that a subpoena with which I have been served be read by the Clerk.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read the subpoena.

The Clerk read as follows:

DISTRICT COURT OF THE UNITED STATES FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

THE UNITED STATES VERSUS JOHN H. LAWSON,
NO. 1352-47 CRIMINAL

The President of the United States to Hon. J. PARNELL THOMAS, 318 Old House Office Building and bring with you copy of subpoena served on John Howard Lawson:

You are hereby commanded to attend the said court on Monday, April 12, 1948, at 1:30 o'clock p. m., to testify on behalf of the United States, and not depart the court without leave of the court or district attorney.

Witness the Honorable Bolitha J. Laws, chief justice of said court, this 7th day of April A. D. 1948.

HARRY M. HULL,

Clerk.

By MARGARET L. BOSWELL,
Deputy Clerk.

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I have been subpoenaed to appear before the District Court of the

United States for the District of Columbia to testify on Monday, April 12, 1948, at 1:30 p. m., in the case of the United States against John H. Lawson, which is a congressional contempt proceeding. Under the precedents of the House I am unable to comply with this subpoena without the consent of the House, the privileges of the House being involved. I therefore submit the matter for the consideration of this body.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 524) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Whereas Representative J. PARNELL THOMAS, a Member of this House, has been served with a subpoena duces tecum to appear as a witness before the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia to testify at 1:30 p. m., on the 12th day of April 1948, in the case of the United States versus John H. Lawson, criminal No. 1352-47; and

Whereas by the privileges of the House no Member is authorized to appear and testify but by the order of the House: Therefore be it Resolved, That Representative J. PARNELL THOMAS is authorized to appear in response to the subpoena duces tecum of the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia on Monday, April 12, 1948, in the case of the United States versus John H. Lawson; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of these resolutions be transmitted to the said court as a respectful answer to the subpoena of the said court.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. JAVITS asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the Record and include a resolution.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, at the conclusion of the regular business of the House today and any other special orders, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 20 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

INTERNATIONAL LABOR ORGANIZATION—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 603)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read by the Clerk, and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed:

To the House of Representatives of the United States:

In accordance with the obligations of the Government of the United States of America as a member of the International Labor Organization, I transmit herewith authentic texts of three conventions and two recommendations formulated at the twenty-ninth session of the International Labor Conference, held at Montreal from September 19 to October 9, 1946. Those conventions and recommendations are as follows:

Convention (No. 77) concerning medical examination for fitness for employment in industry of children and young persons;

Convention (No. 78) concerning medical examination of children and young persons for fitness for employment in nonindustrial occupations;

Convention (No. 79) concerning the restriction of night work of children and young persons in nonindustrial occupations;

Recommendation (No. 79) concerning the medical examination for fitness for employment of children and young persons; and

Recommendation (No. 80) concerning the restriction of night work of children and young persons in nonindustrial occupations.

I transmit also the report of the Acting Secretary of State regarding those Conventions and Recommendations, together with a copy of a letter addressed by the Secretary of Labor to the Secretary of State with respect to those Conventions and Recommendations.

In view of the opinions expressed by the Acting Secretary of State and the Secretary of Labor in the enclosed report and letter, I am not requesting at this time the advice and consent of the Senate to ratification of the three Conventions and am not recommending for the present the enactment of legislation to implement the three Conventions and two Recommendations transmitted herewith. Upon the entry into force of the Constitution of the International Labor Organization Instrument of Amendment, which is expected to occur soon, it is planned that further referral of the enclosed Conventions and Recommendations be made under the provisions of Article 19 of the revised Constitution. The request that no action be taken at present with respect to implementation of the enclosed instruments should not be construed in any sense, therefore, as a rejection on the part of the United States of America of those instruments or of the principles set forth therein.

I am also referring the texts of the Conventions and Recommendations to the Senate.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, April 8, 1948.

(Enclosures: 1. Report of the Acting Secretary of State; 2. Letter from the Secretary of Labor; 3. Authentic texts of Conventions and Recommendations.)

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, April 7, 1948.

The PRESIDENT,

The White House.

The PRESIDENT: The undersigned, the Acting Secretary of State, has the honor to lay before the President, with a view to their transmission to the Senate and the House of Representatives, in accordance with the obligations of the Government of the United States of America as a member of the International Labor Organization, authentic texts of three conventions and two recommendations formulated at the twenty-ninth session of the International Labor Conference, held at Montreal from September 19, to October 9, 1946.

Those conventions and recommendations are, as follows:

Convention (No. 77) concerning medical examination for fitness for employment in industry of children and young persons;

Convention (No. 78) concerning medical examination of children and young persons for fitness for employment in nonindustrial occupations;

Convention (No. 79) concerning the restriction of night work of children and young persons in nonindustrial occupations;

Recommendation (No. 79) concerning the medical examination for fitness for employment of children and young persons; and

Recommendation (No. 80) concerning the restriction of night work of children and young persons in nonindustrial occupations.

There is enclosed herewith a letter from the Secretary of Labor dated April 1, 1948, expressing the coordinated views of the executive departments and agencies concerned with respect to the above-listed conventions and recommendations. It is proposed in that letter "that the conventions not be ratified, and that no action be taken presently with respect to the recommendations."

The latter proposal results from the fact that article 19 of the constitution of the International Labor Organization Instrument of Amendment, which is expected to enter into force in the near future, embodies changes in the obligations of federal governments with respect to referral of conventions and recommendations to the appropriate Federal, State, provincial, or cantonal authorities for the enactment of legislation or other action. Inasmuch as some of those changes require careful analysis and interpretation to establish the exact nature of this Government's obligations, it is believed that before requesting congressional action the interested departments and agencies should make a detailed analysis of the present conventions and recommendations and of existing laws and regulations in order to prepare specific recommendations concerning further legislation or regulations which may be needed to effectuate the standards established in the conventions and recommendations.

It is recommended, accordingly, that the enclosed conventions and recommendations be transmitted to the Senate and the House of Representatives for the information of those bodies, but that for the present, no action be requested of the Senate and the House of Representatives either with a view to approval of the conventions or with respect to the enactment of legislation to implement the conventions and recommendations.

Respectfully submitted.

ROBERT A. LOVETT.

(Enclosures: 1. Letter from the Secretary of Labor; 2. Authentic texts of conventions and recommendations.)

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, April 1, 1948.

The honorable the SECRETARY OF STATE,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: This letter will express to you the coordinated view of the interested agencies and departments of the executive branch with respect to the conventions and recommendations adopted at the twenty-ninth session of the International Labor Conference at Montreal, Canada, from September 19 to October 9, 1946.

It is recommended that all of the conventions and recommendations adopted at the twenty-ninth session be transmitted to the Congress of the United States in accordance with the obligations of the Government of the United States of America as a member of the International Labor Organization, under the constitution of the International Labor Organization now in effect. It is recommended also that the conventions not be ratified and that no action be taken presently with respect to the recommendations.

It is our opinion that the Congress should be advised concurrently that the pending

amendments to the constitution of the International Labor Organization are expected soon to come into effect and that these particular conventions and recommendations will thereafter be referred in accordance with the provisions of article 19 of the amended constitution applicable in the case of a federal state. Our recommendation relative to ratification and legislative action should not, therefore, be construed to reflect either disapproval of the provisions of the conventions and recommendations or declination of such action as is appropriate to bring the law and practice in the United States into conformance with their terms.

When these particular conventions and recommendations are referred in accordance with the provisions of article 19 of the amended constitution applicable in the case of a federal state, an analysis of the existing state legislation in this field and a more complete summary of the terms of these conventions and recommendations will be supplied. In short, the conventions and recommendations provide as follows:

Conventions Nos. 77 and 78 would require medical examinations as a prerequisite to employment of children and young persons under 18 years of age in industrial and non-industrial undertakings (thus covering all types of employment except maritime and agricultural), with at least annual examination of such young workers up to age 18, and up to age 21 for work in occupations involving high health risks.

Convention No. 79 would prohibit night work in nonindustrial occupations for 12 night hours for children and young persons between 14 and 18 years of age who are not subject to full-time compulsory school attendance, and for 14 night hours for children under 14 years of age and children and young persons between 14 and 18 years of age who are subject to full-time compulsory school attendance.

Recommendation No. 79 expresses further recommendations concerning the application of conventions Nos. 77 and 78. Recommendation No. 80 expresses further recommendations concerning the application of convention No. 79.

Yours very truly,

L. B. SCHWELLENBACH,
Secretary of Labor.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 20 minutes on Monday next following the business of the day and special orders heretofore granted.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. TOLLEFSON (at the request of Mr. MACK), for today, on account of official business.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. REED of New York asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD in two separate instances and to include extraneous matter.

FEDERAL-AID HIGHWAY ACT OF 1948

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 521, making in order the bill (H. R. 5888) to amend and supplement the Federal-Aid Road Act approved July 11, 1916 (39 Stat. 355), as amended and supplemented, to authorize appropriations for continuing the construction of highways, and for other

purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 5888) to amend and supplement the Federal-Aid Road Act approved July 11, 1916 (39 Stat. 355), as amended and supplemented, to authorize appropriations for continuing the construction of highways, and for other purposes. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 3 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority members of the Committee on Public Works, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. CHENOWETH].

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, this resolution provides for the consideration of the bill, H. R. 5888, a bill to amend and supplement the Federal Aid Road Act, to authorize appropriations for continuing the construction of highways, and for other purposes.

Mr. Speaker, this is an extension for 3 years of the Federal Aid Highway Act of 1944. It is an open rule and provides for 3 hours of general debate. I am sure the Members of the House are familiar with the Federal Aid Highway Act of 1944 which covered a 3-year period, and under which the Federal Government assists the States in the development of their highway systems on a 50-50 matching basis. That act authorized the appropriation of \$500,000,000 a year for 3 years to carry out the program.

This bill will extend the present law for another 3 years, and authorizes \$500,000,000 per year for an additional 3 years, for the fiscal years ending June 30, 1950, June 30, 1951, and June 30, 1952. There is a lapse of 1 year in this bill—the next fiscal year—for which no assistance is authorized.

Mr. Speaker, I am not going to take the time to explain the details of the bill. This measure was reported to the House by the unanimous vote of the committee. So far as I know, there is no controversy over the details of this legislation.

Contracts for the construction of roads have not been awarded as fast as anticipated. There is a shortage of materials, the contractors have had difficulty in obtaining supplies, and there has been a labor shortage in some places. As a result the different highway commissions have been slow in letting contracts. In some cases the bids have been too high. In others the contractors have been reluctant to bid on proposed projects.

As a result much of the money appropriated under the 1944 act has not been spent. The committee estimates that it will take a year for the funds now on hand to be spent. For this reason no

Appendix

Authorizing Research on Foot-and-Mouth Disease

SPEECH

OF

HON. EUGENE WORLEY

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 7, 1948

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H. R. 5098) to enable the Secretary of Agriculture to conduct research on foot-and-mouth disease and other diseases of animals and to amend the act of May 29, 1884 (23 Stat. 31), as amended, by adding another section.

Mr. GRANGER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. WORLEY].

(Mr. WORLEY asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and include certain resolutions.)

Mr. WORLEY. Mr. Chairman, under leave to extend my remarks I include a resolution adopted by the Texas and Southwestern Cattle Raising Association at their meeting in El Paso, a resolution of the Panhandle Livestock Association and an address by our former colleague, Hon. Richard Kleberg, on the foot-and-mouth disease program.

Mr. Chairman, I think the gentleman from Indiana, Dr. GILLIE, has upon several occasions given Congress a very vivid description of what would happen if the United States should suffer another outbreak of foot-and-mouth disease as we have had in the past. I regret to say that some people seem to look upon this threat as a local problem which endangers only the border States. Most everyone realizes that the disease itself travels as fast as a prairie fire, and could be transported as quickly from Mexico to the State of New York or Washington as it could be to Texas, although the proximity of the border States to Mexico does make us more immediately vulnerable. But suppose it should break out? The immediate result would be action by the several States themselves and the Federal Government to begin slaughter and burial of all livestock affected by or even exposed to the disease. I am sorry to say that the only method yet known, the only sure and positive method for eradication of the foot-and-mouth disease is slaughter and burial of infected animals. We are at least 100 years behind in the research program on this disease.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WORLEY. I yield.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. The gentleman is close to the border and knows a great deal about the attitude of the Mexican people. Does he not feel

that the very fact we have entered upon a slaughtering program of these cattle has built up an antipathy in the minds of some of the people who have had to lose their cattle?

Mr. WORLEY. It has not only built up antipathy, but unfortunately, also a good bit of strenuous opposition.

We are not a sovereign power in Mexico but I feel we have the right to ask for their fullest cooperation in combating this disease. I think President Aleman and most of the informed Mexican people are just as anxious to rid themselves of this disease as we are to see them do it, but there are certain economic factors as the gentleman from Indiana, Dr. GILLIE, has pointed out, which have retarded and in fact practically stalemated our proposed program in Mexico.

I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota, who is on his feet, but first may I say that should this disease become widespread in this country the dangers to the dairy people of the gentleman's State and the subsequent cost of milk and meat to the consumers would make a mighty grim picture. I think the gentleman will agree with the accuracy of that statement.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I agree with the gentleman's statement. We also have other threats to the dairy industry.

Mr. WORLEY. I understand, but let us not get into that question at this particular time.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. The gentleman indicated that we are probably a hundred years behind in our research.

Mr. WORLEY. I stated in my opinion that we are.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Other countries, England, Sweden, and countries on the continent have had hoof-and-mouth disease under control for years. Does the gentleman not feel that we might profit some by the research and efforts of those countries?

Mr. WORLEY. If the gentleman will examine the hearings of the subcommittee on this particular subject he will find that I not only agree, but I am enthusiastically for this country taking advantage of every bit of scientific data and knowledge that the other countries have developed.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. WORLEY] has expired.

Mr. GRANGER. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman five additional minutes.

Mr. WORLEY. On that point, I will say to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN] that the Department of Agriculture has already sent a number of their personnel to England, Sweden, and other countries of Europe

to avail themselves of whatever information they could get. I know there will be some opposition to the location of this laboratory. I say, in all kindness to the gentleman from New York [Mr. MACY] it certainly is not my intention or the intention of any member of the committee to try to locate the laboratory in a district where it is not desired. But I will also say further that, in my opinion, if we are to have a research program, then we almost have to accept what has been worked out in this bill. I think the gentleman from New York will be amply safeguarded, he and his district, when the actual appropriation bill for this measure comes before the House. I am sure he realizes the distinguished, able, and very powerful Member from his State of New York [Mr. TABER], chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, will look into the suggested appropriation with his usual care and thoroughness, and see that the site finally selected is justified from every angle. If the gentleman can show to us any other site which would be more desirable or better for the research laboratory, I hope he will do so.

We have thus far been mighty lucky in holding the quarantine line in Mexico since the outbreak. The committee hopes to go down there soon and take a first-hand look at the entire program, and will report back to the Congress. But if we are ever going to get started on a research program, which is so vital not only to the cattle industry but to the entire economy of the United States, I hope we will take that first step today.

RESOLUTION ADOPTED AT CONVENTION OF TEXAS AND SOUTHWESTERN CATTLE RAISERS ASSOCIATION, EL PASO, TEX.

Mr. President, your committee on resolutions has completed its work and begs leave to now report to the convention the result of its deliberations, and, in doing so, respectfully represents to the convention that, although there are many serious and weighty problems confronting us at this time, they all are reduced to comparative insignificance by the great weight of one problem—foot-and-mouth disease—and, for that reason, we recommend the adoption of one resolution—and only one—which deals with this most serious of all problems.

Your committee recommends the following:

RESOLUTION

It is regretfully true that the enormity and the gravity of the problem that we face because of the existence of foot-and-mouth disease in Mexico is not realized by the American people. The false impression that this problem is peculiar to the livestock industry and even localized on the border area is all too prevalent. This problem is of national significance and bears upon all sections of the country, as well as upon all phases of our economy, because it is a direct threat to the American—which now means the world's—food supply. We hope that the genuine universality of this danger will become known to all of the American people

because we believe that from such knowledge will come strength to solve the problem.

Because of our single purpose, which is to protect our country from the disaster that foot-and-mouth disease brings, we, the Texas and Southwestern Cattle Raisers Association, in annual convention assembled in El Paso, Tex., do hereby adopt the following resolution:

I

We state it to be a fact that not only are the American people entitled to, but it is necessary that they should at all times be given full, complete, and entirely accurate information concerning foot-and-mouth disease, its characteristics and the full significance of what an outbreak of the disease in our own country would be. The American people should likewise be given the same type of information concerning all developments in the program being conducted in Mexico in conjunction with the Mexican Government. This problem is of grave national and international concern, is public in its nature, and no part of the true facts should be concealed or withheld. Any agencies of our Government possessing information concerning the problem or the program should immediately pass all of that information on to the public with complete frankness and accuracy.

II

We wish to express our gratitude and appreciation to the entire Congress of the United States for its intelligent comprehension of the seriousness of the foot-and-mouth problem and we commend the Congress for the thoroughness and speed with which it enacted all legislation requested for the purpose of combating the foot-and-mouth disease problem. Especially do we appreciate and commend the fine and effective work done by the subcommittee of the House Committee on Agriculture known as the "Gillie committee" for its study of the problem and its report to the Congress. We further express our keen appreciation of the whole-hearted and intelligent action of the Appropriations Committee of the House and the Appropriations Committee of the Senate in handling legislation in connection with making available the funds necessary to fight the disease and protect our country. In this matter, the entire Congress truly and intelligently represented and acted for the welfare of the entire country and the good of the people.

III

This association has heretofore, on several occasions, urged that the Department of Agriculture enter upon a program of scientific research into foot-and-mouth disease. We are aware of the fact that the Department of Agriculture now desires to institute a research program for the close study of foot-and-mouth disease in all its aspects and we fully endorse such purpose, but, at the same time, we respectfully suggest that such belated study and research can be of very little, if any, value in the present emergency fight to eradicate the disease from Mexico, though it would undoubtedly be of value in years to come. We are aware that the Department of Agriculture has requested legislation of the Congress to enable it to, at its discretion, establish such research laboratory in the continental United States. We have not forgotten the lessons taught us for many years by the Department of Agriculture, its experts, and by other scientists, and we greatly fear that if such research into foot-and-mouth disease be conducted in the continental United States, the fact that such research and experimentation would have to be done with the active, live virus would constitute a serious danger to our industry from a possible outbreak of the disease inducted by such virus escaping from the control of the researchers. We, therefore, reiterate our pre-

viously expressed position that we are opposed to such research being conducted within the continental limits of the United States and hope that the importation of the live virus in any form, or through any medium, will be prohibited. But we do express our hope that such research work outside the United States be authorized and provision be made therefor.

IV

We are regretfully aware of the fact that the patrol of the international boundary line for the protection of this country against the infiltration of foot-and-mouth disease is now and has at all times been inadequate and ineffective. We urge that this patrol of our border be so strengthened and improved that it will be impossible for contraband livestock or other commodities to cross the boundary line or be brought into this country.

V

The canning program being rapidly developed in the northern states of Mexico is proving to be a valuable and effective method for the disposal of large numbers of surplus cattle in that area. The full protection of this presently uninfected area and the recognition of the necessity for providing a market for the livestock of these Mexican states situated north of the quarantine line is essential to a well-considered plan of eradication of the foot-and-mouth disease in Mexico. We commend the Department of Agriculture of the United States and all of its agencies employed in the program for the efficient and aggressive handling of this phase of the eradication work. And we further state that this particular project is so vital to the entire program that we insist that contracts for the purchase of canned meats from the named area be extended beyond the current fiscal year ending June 30, 1948.

VI

The position of this association on the foot-and-mouth disease problem is the same now that it has been at all times. That this disease must be eradicated. Its presence upon the North American Continent cannot be tolerated. The respective economies of the United States and of the Republic of Mexico cannot bear the burden of having this disease fastened on any place on the continent, nor will the safety of the food supply of the world permit such strain to exist.

We deeply regret that efforts to secure eradication of the disease in Mexico have not been successful. We realize that large sums of money have been expended by our country in the effort at eradication without success but we know that eradication must be accomplished. Not until such eradication has been effected will we be able to breathe with relief and face our responsibility of producing food for the world with any degree of confidence.

It is our recommendation that a sincere fight to eradicate the disease be kept up constantly. We recommend that those officials upon whom rests the responsibility for the conduct of this fight concentrate their efforts to eradicate the disease by following a carefully planned program that will have ultimate success.

First and foremost we recommend that the northern quarantine line in Mexico be developed into a genuine quarantine line. We fear that the present effort to maintain this northern quarantine line is not adequate. We cannot urge too strongly that such quarantine line, which is the outer defense for our country, be rigidly and hermetically maintained.

We recommend that the responsible officials actually secure the adoption of the suggestions made by the Congress of the United States, which suggestions are also the suggestions of the official advisory committee,

and that a qualified person be selected and appointed to manage and control the entire program and that such person be clothed with full authority to conduct the campaign.

We recommend that, between the quarantine line and the zone of infection a buffer zone be established and that all necessary steps, including slaughter and burial of any livestock that might become infected or directly exposed to infection in that zone and the judicious use of the best available vaccine, be adopted to keep such buffer zone free of infection. In the event of an outbreak above the quarantine line we recommend the immediate slaughter and burial on the spot of all infected and exposed livestock in that area and a complete quarantine of such zone of outbreak.

We recommend that constant effort be made to eradicate the disease within the zone of infection beginning at the northern edge of such zone and progressing southward. In such effort every available method must be used. Where practicable, slaughter and burial of infected and exposed livestock should be conducted. And, whenever the circumstances justify such method, use of vaccine and localized quarantine and isolation of stock and premises, having in mind that, at all times the slaughter and burial method is the only proven method of successful eradication and the education of the affected people should not be neglected and whenever an area shall have been determined to have been cleared of infection, then restock such area, moving the southern quarantine line of the buffer zone so as to incorporate such cleaned area within such buffer zone. By such constant and serious pressure on the infection it is hoped and believed that the infection can gradually but surely be eradicated from all parts of our neighboring Republic and the danger to our own country and to the world's food supply can be eliminated.

It is our very sincere and earnest hope that the two nations involved, the United States and the Republic of Mexico, and all officials, representatives, and the agents of these two countries will never lose sight of the ultimate objective—the freeing of the North American Continent from the curse of the infestation of foot-and-mouth disease. It is likewise our hope that the conduct of this campaign will be such that it will cement mutual friendship and respect between the Governments and the peoples. And it is our hope and trust that the effort to prevent the further spread of the disease toward the international boundary line between the two countries will be successful, but we fear that, unless greatly strengthened, such will not be the result. And any spread of the disease north of the present quarantine line will constitute an increased danger that will necessitate this country strengthening its defenses at the boundary line.

In the event of such a spread north of the present quarantine line—which we hope will not happen—then it is our recommendation that in order to provide the then greatest available degree of security for our country and for the food supply of our people and of the world, it will be necessary to close the international boundary line to all traffic and commerce until such time as the same may be resumed with security and safety.

RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY PANHANDLE LIVESTOCK ASSOCIATION IN ANNUAL CONVENTION AT AMARILLO, TEX., MARCH 2, 1948

RESEARCH

Whereas it has been deemed expedient that our Government appropriate such a sum of money as is necessary to properly carry on research into the foot-and-mouth disease and our Congress is now considering the passage of a bill making such research possible; and

Whereas we have at all times been advised by our Bureau of Animal Industry and scientists of the hazards involved by bringing infected animals into this country for a study of the disease: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we do urge the research study be begun immediately; that Congress does make available ample funds for such research; but that so long as foot-and-mouth disease is not present in these United States, that such laboratories be established and such research be made at some place outside the continental United States.

FOOT-AND-MOUTH DISEASE

Whereas foot-and-mouth disease constitutes the greatest threat to the livestock industry and agriculture in general that this country has ever been faced with; and

Whereas the Congress of the United States has continually issued mandates to the Department of Agriculture to negotiate with the Mexican Government and develop an eradication program, and has appropriated vast sums of money to carry out such a program. The Industry Advisory Committee to the Secretary of Agriculture, all segments of livestock, cattle, sheep, and hogs; the dairy industry, and national farm organizations have all from time to time and repeatedly urged the Department of State, the Department of Agriculture, and even the President of these United States, to address themselves seriously to the development of an adequate and effective plan for the control and eradication of this dire threat to our national economy; and

Whereas today we find ourselves no closer to an accomplishment of this objective than we were when the disease was first declared present in Mexico: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Panhandle Live Stock Association in convention assembled at Amarillo, Tex., on March 2, 1948, add its voice to the rapidly growing rebellion against such a willful neglect of the expressed wishes of Congress and the needs of the people. We earnestly request that our Senators and Members of Congress look deeply into the reasons for such failure and forthwith take steps to correct in any manner deemed necessary, such an evil threat to our industry; be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be furnished the principal newspapers of Texas and all of the Members of Congress from Texas.

Mr. Chairman, under leave to extend my remarks, I submit herewith a very interesting speech made by our former colleague, Hon. Richard Kleberg, on the foot-and-mouth-disease problem. The address was delivered in Lincoln on February 4 to the Nebraska Livestock Breeders and Feeders Association:

Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen, the subject assigned to me by Mr. W. W. Derrick, the Seriousness of the Foot-and-Mouth-Disease Outbreak in Mexico as it Affects American Cattle Raisers, seems to me to be one which limits those who are endangered to a degree which is not consistent with the real purpose of my being here.

I am sure that you will pardon me if in range parlance I bust the hamestrings for the purpose of including all those who really suffer from the existence of foot-and-mouth disease in Mexico. In the first place, North America, including Mexico, up until December 26, 1946, was the only large part of the world contiguously joined that had been free of foot-and-mouth disease for a period of 10 years. In the second place, for over 6,000 years famines have occurred almost everywhere in the civilized world save in the United States of America. We have never had an alarming famine. In the third place, the existence of foot-and-mouth disease in Mexico seriously menaces the productivity and economy of the United States, Canada,

and Mexico. Foot-and-mouth disease in the North American continent, and I hope you will please heed this statement, is at the moment the most serious menace to the entire world picture looking toward a hope-for lasting peace and better conditions throughout the world.

The relationship today of the United States to both the peace of this world and food for its starving millions, it is not necessary for me to discuss in detail.

Too, as you all know, the reiterated policy and system of government of a large part of the Old World, looking constantly toward the overthrow of all other forms of constituted authority by means of revolution, is best served by hunger wherever it is found. The one major difficulty which confronts the authorities of the United States, looking toward the eradication of foot-and-mouth disease on the North American Continent, is that the outbreak is on the soil of a foreign country, Mexico. Foot-and-mouth disease would have long ceased to be a menace or even news had the outbreak occurred on soil of the United States. Manifestly, this is true because the outbreaks in this country of 1870, 1880, 1884, 1902, 1908, 1914, 1925, and 1929 were all quickly, effectively, and completely combatted with eradication of the disease in each instance. One of the outbreaks, the one in my home State, Texas, which occurred September 27, 1924, according to the United States Yearbook of Agriculture of 1925, pages 65 and 66, states as follows: "Methods similar to those used in suppressing the California outbreak resulted in the suppression of infection in Texas within 30 days." The method referred to used for the suppression of the disease and its eradication involved first the throwing of a real quarantine line around the area where the infected cattle were located. Immediately following this, representatives of the Government slaughtered every animal infected, together with every animal subjected to exposure to the disease. The slaughtered animals were placed in large pits with their hides slashed to render the hide unusable. The cattle were then covered with quicklime, and, thus buried, were incapable of continuing to spread the infection. There being no further source of infection, eradication was complete insofar as the extension of the disease was concerned. The quarantined premises were kept under quarantine for 60 days. All of those engaged in work within the quarantined area, as well as those who lived within the area, were subjected to strong disinfectants, particularly their hands and feet and lower limbs and clothing, each time it was necessary for them to pass through the quarantine lines and into clean or uninfected areas.

After 60 days, the range was restocked with cattle which were kept under observation until they had proven that the infection no longer existed and the premises were clean. I give you this example only for the purpose of indicating the truth of my statement that, had the disease occurred in the United States, it would have long since been over. I think it best at this juncture to give you a short description of the disease known as foot-and-mouth disease. The latest truly valued authority on this subject is found in the 1942 Yearbook of Agriculture, starting on page 263 where you will find an article on foot-and-mouth disease by Dr. J. R. Mohler and Dr. Jacob Traum. Dr. Mohler was at that time Chief of the Bureau of Animal Industry of the United States, and Dr. Traum was professor of veterinary science at the University of California. Under the heading of "Character of the disease," I quote as follows from the same authority:

"Foot-and-mouth disease is characterized by the formation of vesicles or blisters on the mucous membranes covering the tongue, lips, cheeks, palate, and other tissues of the mouth, on the skin between and above the claws of the feet, and on the teats and udder,

in cattle any one or several of these locations may be involved. In hogs lesions frequently occur also on and above the snout. In rare cases the muscles of cattle are affected. In sheep, goats, and deer, the feet are the most common site of the vesicle formation. As a rule, these vesicles rupture within 24 hours, leaving a raw, eroded, red surface. Mouth lesions cause salivation, especially in cattle. In none of these lesions is there the pustule formation which is always so characteristic a part of the disease process in pox diseases.

"The lesions of foot-and-mouth disease heal rather rapidly, but in some instances those on the feet may give rise to serious bacterial infections. Before and for a short time after the appearance of lesions there is a striking rise in temperature. During the attack the animals lose considerable flesh. In cows there is a severe reduction in the milk flow.

"The symptoms vary in extent from one or two small vesicles in one of the locations mentioned to extensive involvement of several of the locations. In some cattle more than one-half of the covering of the tongue may be lifted and the claws of all four feet may be lost.

"The deterioration of the animals may cause far greater loss than the actual mortality, which is estimated in ordinary outbreaks to be approximately 5 percent. There is, however, a malignant form of the disease which may be accompanied by heart lesions. In such outbreaks as many as 50 percent of the affected animals succumb or are so seriously injured that they have to be slaughtered, even in countries where eradication by this method is not practiced.

"The infective agent in foot-and-mouth disease is a filterable virus. Virus can pass through filters that hold back the smallest bacteria, and they cannot be seen with the most powerful microscope. The size of the foot-and-mouth-disease virus has been estimated to be between 8 and 12 millimicrons, which places it among the most minute of these ultra-microscopic infective agents. The virus is present in the fluid and the coverings of the vesicles and can also be found in the blood in the initial febrile (feverish) state of the disease. Saliva, milk, urine, and other secretions may also contain the virus. It is not definitely known whether these fluids contain the virus at their source, in the salivary glands, mammary glands, etc., or are infected later by becoming mixed with the vesicle fluids or coverings. For practical control of lesions, the important consideration is that the virus may be present in these secretions, which should be considered as infectious. The fluid and coverings of the vesicles in the animal usually lapse into infectivity within 4 to 6 days after the lesions occur."

You will see by this description of the disease how serious it is. All authorities agree that it is the most infectious and contagious of all livestock diseases. A close study of conditions under which materials harboring the virus are found outside the animal body determine its viability, or ability to remain alive, and its infectivity. There are conditions under which the virus perishes in a very short time. When kept in an incubator temperature corresponding to the body temperature (98.5° F.), it has not produced disease after 24 to 48 hours, but at room temperature, such as 65° to 68° F., it has been kept alive for weeks. In the ice-box, at temperatures between 39.2° and 44.6° F., it has been found alive after many months. When rapidly dried, particularly at temperatures below the freezing point, where no air has access to it, it remained alive for several years. I quote again from the article referred to:

"It is important to note, however, that owing to the great infectiousness of foot-and-mouth disease, experiments with it are not conducted within the United States.

Experimental work by the United States Department of Agriculture has been done in foreign countries by arrangement with the veterinarians and other public officials."

For your added information, there are only two other diseases, which resemble foot-and-mouth disease and which are found in cattle, swine, sheep, goats, and other cloven-footed animals. These two are virus diseases, one of them vesicular stomatitis and the other vesicular exanthema of swine. It would be well to carry in mind that the first of these is more common to horses than it is to other animals. The latter, vesicular exanthema of swine, likewise has been found to produce mild irritation in horses. Foot-and-mouth disease never attacks horses. In fact, experiments by inoculation have all failed in the case of horses. The only country which has been successful in eradicating the disease promptly following each outbreak has been the United States of America. It has accomplished eradication each time by means of the quarantine plan and burial method described earlier in my remarks. In fact, this is the only method which to date has been successful. Attempts to eradicate it by vaccination have proven futile in each instance. Likewise, attempts to hold it confined to an area by quarantine alone have all been futile.

From the moment that foot-and-mouth disease occurred in Mexico, the great food resources of the United States and Canada, as well as Mexico, were threatened. In our country, however, there is much more at stake than merely food resources. I will get to this in more detail later on in my remarks. Let me for the moment make this statement of conviction with all the emphasis which I can muster: One of the best ways to insure continued progress is to never forget those things responsible for our past progress as well as those which have blocked or may still block our development in America to its highest peak. We all know what we would have done had this disease broken out in these United States. Conditions, however, in Mexico are very different. There, you deal where the disease is now raging with farmers, small ranchmen, and peons of the low-income class as well as those of the no-income class. There, you deal with a rugged terrain with no roads, no automobiles or trucks, almost no radios, telephones, and telegraphic service, no country grocery stores, few if any towns where food and other necessary supplies may be purchased, etc. The people in this area are as nearly wholly dependent upon their oxen and milk cows and goats and their hogs as are to be found anywhere in the world. The oxen are used yoked to a primitive sharp-pointed stick as a plow, no harness as in the case of a Missouri mule, no tractors. The oxen are likewise used for transportation, in some of these sections, of supplies to market places yoked to huge wooden-wheeled carts. The people in this area when they go to town either ride a burro, walk on feet shod with guaraches (crude sandals laced between the toes and covering only the soles of the feet), on horseback a few, and others in carts drawn by oxen, and crude light wagons drawn by burros.

So you can readily see that the slaughter campaign alone, such as would be employed in the United States, would immediately leave these people without the means of producing corn, which is their staple food, or beef, goat flesh, or milk. They would be without employment which depends upon the use of these essentials just mentioned. In short, they would starve. It is natural, therefore, for them to oppose with great vehemence any program which would leave them in this plight. The present program in effect in Mexico, agreed upon by the Gov-

ernments of the United States and Mexico, is a program which I believe to be utterly puerile. It is a plan which calls for the establishment of a quarantine line surrounding the infected area, together with a program of vaccination beginning at the quarantine line and closing in on the infected area, hoping thus to be able to eradicate the disease. This plan, of course, is doomed to worse than failure because, instead of eradicating the disease, it will probably be the most effective means of finally spreading it all over Mexico up to the boundary line between the United States and Mexico. The plan adopted by the United States-Mexico Foot-and-Mouth Disease Commission will bring about the maintenance of dangerous carriers of the disease—animals that have already recovered from the disease, together with those who are sick at the time, all of which will be merely vaccinated and will not be destroyed. No static line has ever been held or will ever be held against the ravages of this dread pestilence by vaccine and quarantine alone. Vaccine has no curative effect whatsoever, and the best available vaccine reputedly will immunize a high percentage of the cattle for a period of at most 6 months. By the records, cattle have been known to contract the disease within a period of 30 days after vaccination, which is another evidence of the futility of this plan.

The task of eradicating foot-and-mouth disease in Mexico is in my opinion by no means futile, as it apparently seems to be to many in high places. Even my good friend, the Honorable GEORGE W. GILLIE of Indiana, chairman of the Special House Subcommittee on Foot-and-Mouth Disease, has apparently accepted the futility of the fight in Mexico as inevitable. In the third paragraph of a speech which he made before the forty-eighth annual conference of the Veterinary Alumni Society, University of Pennsylvania at Philadelphia, on January 6, he made this statement, and I quote: "So whether we like it or not—and I for one frankly admit that I do not like it, we have got to learn the tricks of living with the foot and mouth disease if not actually in the United States, at least on the North American continent." Dr. GILLIE is a veterinarian and I cannot help but express my extreme disappointment in his having made such a statement. The facts are that we have not even attempted to fight the disease in Mexico by means of a program which fits the exigencies of that situation down there. There is, however, such a program before the authorities at this present moment, a program which is known as the Texas plan, and I propose here and now to submit this plan to you for your consideration. It is as follows:

A practical plan of systematic eradication, and one that probably would be acceptable to the Mexicans, should include the following:

1. Establish a quarantine line north of the zone of infection and exposure.
2. Vaccinate all susceptible animals north of that line for a distance of some 10 to 20 miles, taking into consideration natural barriers so far as possible.
3. While establishing the quarantine line and vaccinating all susceptible animals in the barrier area, start a campaign to eradicate systematically the disease in the zone of infection. This would involve the progressive purchase of all susceptible animals south of the quarantine line.
4. Title to the animals should be vested in the United States Government and, to make the area clean, they should be disposed of as rapidly as possible. With proper safeguards, a large percentage of the cattle could be used for human food, either in Mexico, south of

the line, or for export after canning, south of the same line.

5. When an area or premises has been free of susceptible animals for 60 days restock it immediately with animals bought by the United States Government. These replacements would come from the clean area north of the quarantine line. Vaccination would be indicated by metal tags bearing Government stamp and date.

6. Any animals allowed to cross quarantine lines or to stray to clean premises should be killed, and no compensation provided. As further discouragement of such practices, the owner should be penalized heavily.

7. Continuous inspection of the tagged and vaccinated area must be maintained. Any outbreak of the disease in the area should be cleaned up immediately by slaughter and burial on the premises, and appropriate quarantine of the property established.

8. The United States should provide all vaccine for use on properly tagged animals from clean zones, but for no other. Use of vaccines by us in any other way should not be permitted.

9. Penalties for violation of any regulations for eradication of the foot-and-mouth disease should be provided.

10. In eradicating the foot-and-mouth disease, speed is essential. The work should go forward as rapidly as possible, consistent with the ability of the two countries to restore the economy of the infected area.

In the area south of the proposed quarantine line most of the cattle are on the open range. They are kept under control by herding in daytime and penning at night. There are very few wild cattle in the area, and so far very few wild animals have been found infected.

OPERATION OF PLAN

In the eradication program it may be found better policy to work in zones of specified kilometers or by States or other natural or political subdivisions.

In certain areas small holders may need temporary sustenance. This could be provided by giving them jobs in the program. The Red Cross and the Cruz Roja could be called in if necessary to provide for individuals temporarily destitute.

Some incentive compensation should be allowed for those carrying on the work, whether Mexican Army men on patrol or veterinarians in the field. The basis could be a certain number of dollars a head on all tagged and vaccinated animals used for replacement.

In considering the above proposals it must be borne in mind that the scientific plan developed by Dr. John Mohier calls for restocking premises 60 days after they have been cleaned up and contact broken with infected cattle. The soundness of this procedure is proved by the English experience, where over 57,000 different premises were cleaned up and disinfected, and after 6 weeks to 2 months, were restocked. Only 57 of these premises became reinfected.

When all the premises in an area are freed of infection for 60 days and restocked only with clean, vaccinated cattle the tract will stay clean for 6 months or forever if the plan is fully carried out. Animals have to be vaccinated every 6 to 8 months. There is no vaccine, so far as is known, that would assure immunity for a longer period.

The most reliable source of the vaccine is Holland, Denmark, and Switzerland. These countries have a limited quantity of vaccine usable until November 1948. They have not enough on hand for the job in Mexico, but Holland presumably could make as many as 70,000 doses a week when in full-scale production.

A dose of 30 centimeters is required to immunize one mature animal. The cost in Europe probably would vary from 80 cents to \$1.60 a dose. The vaccine would have to be brought over in liter containers under controlled temperatures.

ADVANTAGES OF PLAN

The suggested plan has several advantages that are important and particularly suited to the situation in Mexico.

1. The owner is deprived of his livestock only 60 days. The replacement animals to him will be healthy and certain to remain free of the disease at least 6 months.

2. A market for the cattle of northern Mexico will be provided in the restocking of the cleaned-up area.

3. The cattle of southern Mexico will be improved, since the animals of northern Mexico are far better, on the whole, than those in the remainder of that country.

4. Since clean, freshly vaccinated cattle are always kept on the front line, and the front line is constantly advancing, this plan of attack is the safest.

COMPARISON OF PLANS

The plan adopted by the joint Mexico-United States Commission has none of the above advantages. Since dangerous carriers, cattle already exposed to the disease and in some cases even sink animals, probably will be vaccinated along with the others, the plan has no chance to succeed and eventually will fasten the disease on all Mexico.

No fixed quarantine line ever has been held by vaccine or any other method. Since vaccine has no curative effect, it is clear that its use as planned by the joint commission is the same old method used in Europe. This has curtailed the ravages of the disease, but has been of no value so far as eradication is concerned. The disease cannot be contained by any such plan. The malady certainly will jump the quarantine line. Neither northern Mexico nor the United States is safe under that program.

On the other hand, the new method suggested offers safeguards additional to the scientific tried and true Mohler plan. We believe that it could be used to eradicate the disease in Mexico, Argentina, or anywhere else in the world, provided, of course, that it is properly implemented.

The use of the vaccine as specified in the joint Mexico-American Commission plan has the cart before the horse and should be discarded.

Hearings before committees in Washington are now going on concerning bills which have been introduced looking to the erecting of research laboratories in the United States or elsewhere for the purpose of studying and developing controls for foot-and-mouth disease. These research laboratories will be called upon to produce vaccines, serums, etc.

Right here and now let me state that I am for the erection, maintenance, and operation of research laboratories for this purpose elsewhere but not in or on the land of the United States. My opposition to the location of such research establishments within the United States is not based on any prejudice whatsoever, but to the contrary. I hope it is based on sound reason backed by the past records and experiences already had in this country with reference to this dread pestilence.

The outbreaks of 1902 and 1908, by the records, were traced to imported vaccine and virus carrying material from Japan where foot-and-mouth disease then existed. The research at that time was conducted in laboratories where research efforts, looking toward the development of counter-active virus and serum for smallpox in human beings, was being carried on.

Surely the care, scientific and otherwise, used in safeguarding this material would be at least as great as that which could be expected of today's scientists. This is reason number one for the record.

Reason No. 2 is that I can see no earthly common sense or scientific advantage to increasing the danger of foot-and-mouth disease outbreaks in this country by adding another source of danger. The outbreak in Mexico is the other source. Unless our scientists have grown soft and seek the continued comforts of their homeland to the extent of being willing to endanger that very homeland instead of sacrificing said comforts, I can see no reason why the research laboratories should not be set up in England, in France, or in Germany, if Mexico is not satisfactory. I would recommend the expenditure of requisite funds providing for the necessary building, laboratory equipment, and staffing of such an enterprise in England as a preferred place. A staff of American experts and students would be well received as allies in this line of research which has long been going forward in Britain.

I would recommend the periodic shipment to England of clean livestock from these United States for purposes of experimental tests.

It might take years to develop a vaccine more potent and effective than that now available and I, therefore, see no sound reason in the proposal that we increase the dangers to our country by adding the inevitable danger of working with the dread virus on our own land.

As a matter of fact the No. 1 thing on the agenda of the American people, all consumers and even infants are interested, should be a strong Nation-wide appeal from the people direct to their Congress, to their Senators and Congressmen, to their President, and we not adopt a defeatist attitude in this hour of grave emergency, but that we immediately do something to see to it that a plan which is at least thoroughly logical, and which will inevitably work, be put into effect as soon as possible. The sooner the better. Too much invaluable time has already been lost which makes it all the more imperative that every effort be made now to win this fight which we must win or suffer the consequences.

Let us take just a look at what these consequences look like—and I must be brief in this. In the first place, most other countries where foot-and-mouth disease exists, and where the people have been forced to live with it, are blessed by green grass for the major part of the year, together with plentiful water for livestock, located not too far apart between watering places. A poor brute with a sore mouth cannot eat dry or hard feed, grass or otherwise. Likewise, one with sore feet cannot walk 2 or more miles to water over hard, dry ground. The major cattle ranches of this country have dry grass for 6 months or more during the year, and watering places are generally far apart. Enough of that. Let us pause for an instant to peer over the fence at what is going on in our neighbor nation's back yard. Our first impulse and reaction is, of course, to do what we can to help our neighbor.

Our next reaction is likewise a natural one, best expressed in good old-fashioned American words: "Good heavens. Suppose that this should happen to us. We had better do something about it before it is too late." The trouble with us is that the full impact of impending disaster has not yet hit us. Let's see what we see across that border when we look at it: North of the present quarantine line, south of which dread foot-and-mouth disease rages, we see cattlemen and farmers possessed of 10,000,000 head of cattle who are now limited to the Mexican market where low prices prevail. South of the line is real tragedy; farmers and tenants owning approximately 4,000,000 head of cattle, to which may be added sheep, goats, and hogs. These farmers may not ship or transport any cattle, livestock products, dairy, beef cattle, or goat products save to those markets restricted to them within this quarantine zone where there are practically no markets and where

prices are still lower. Too, the products of their tilled fields, grain, hay, farm products, vegetables, and fruits stagnate without proper markets. Those within the infected area can move nothing capable of transmitting the dread pestilence. This disease can be transmitted by hay, by dogs who try to cross infected areas and cross over into clean premises, automobiles, trucks, burros, men on foot—in short, anything that comes in direct contact with the infection, which may be on grass or on bare soil, may transmit this infection.

With the hopelessness of the present program, we can properly expect, if no chance is made, to have foot-and-mouth disease at the very boundary of these United States in a short time, and, if along the full length of our very long international boundary this disease knocks at the door, no quarantine which we establish, however strict, can hold it in check.

We will certainly have outbreaks in these United States. Dependent upon the number and the scope of these outbreaks will be its actual cost to us in holding it in check. The entire livestock industry, stockyards, packers, feeders, dairymen, etc., will immediately be dislocated from stem to stern. The very foundation upon which the credit structure of these United States now rests will tremble and crack as though from an earthquake.

The fate of the United States cow is far more important to all of the people in our homeland than the fate of any other cow anywhere in this world. Cattle in the United States (dairy and beef) form the keystone in the arch which supports our credit structure. There are, in round figures, 1,903,000,000 acres of land in the continental United States and Alaska. Of this enormous area, in excess of 70 percent of the acreage depends upon cattle alone for the conversion of its surface production into wealth. In excess of 50 cents out of every dollar produced by the productions of the tilled lands of this Nation is realized by the passage of this production through cattle, beef and dairy.

Stop for a moment and consider the manpower hours involved in felling great trees in the forests of Maine and the Pacific Northwest, the manpower hours expended in floating or sledding these trees to sawmills for conversion into lumber, considering only those whose planks and lumber will go into farmhouses, barns, fences, corrals, cattle cars, trucks, trailers, etc., that hold only cattle and their byproducts, beef and dairy. Consider the manpower hours in mines from the mining of the virgin ore to and through to conversion into rails, wheels, and axles, the equipment of great creameries, great packing plants, together with the manpower hours of those who operate the trains and trucks and creameries, etc. Consider, if you will, the manpower hours in the production and harvesting of our Nation's grain crops, in transporting these crops to elevators, in operating the elevators, the feed lots, the stockyards, etc., the manpower hours in manufacturing knives, cleavers, forks, frying pans, skillets, broilers, etc., that spent in moving, bailing, and transporting sorghums, hay, alfalfa, legumes, etc., and you see why at the outset I refused to accept the limitations imposed by the subject assigned me.

Yes, my friends, the foot-and-mouth disease in Mexico is more than an American cattleman's problem. It is North America's problem. It is hungry Europe's problem. But this is not all. The United States cow is truly the foster mother of American babies. More of her milk goes down their young throats even than the milk of their mothers.

A great American patriot spoke the voice and words of these United States in days remote, when our Republic was young, when he said "Give me liberty or give me death." Our United States now has become part and

parcel not only of our lives but of our liberty. We North Americans, Mexicans, citizens of the United States and Canadians, of this generation fail in our sacred trust to discharge our responsibility to future Americans if we do not meet the issue of the possible future which foot-and-mouth disease in Mexico establishes for us. The great dairy farms in the East and Central North depend for their cows on western and southwestern cattle ranches, as do many of the feed lots depend on the steers and calves from western and southwestern ranches. Both dairy and beef cattle products processed in the North and East find their way to almost all of the central and southern portion of this country. This great movement and traffic upon which our supply and production of livestock production depend will be impaired and reduced almost to a complete standstill, dependent upon how widespread infections of foot-and-mouth disease now in Mexico might be in these United States tomorrow. If we permit this disease to fix itself over all Mexico to our boundary line, we would probably face a more forbidding future even than I have painted. The Governments of both Mexico and the United States should face the fact that this is not a political war which could affect the respective parties in power, but to the contrary, it is a problem requiring the combined geniuses of the best minds in both countries, irrespective of party or politics, to combat. The benefit will be not only for North America, but for the whole world.

The United States of America is the only spot on this terrestrial planet where freedom of individual enterprise and the untrammelled development of individual genius exists today. Human energy cannot furnish the maximum efficiency save in the case of freemen, but freedom and responsibility are indivisible consorts, therefore responsibility cannot be taken to mean license. We cannot be licentious in our approach to the solution of this problem. Laissez faire is a form of licentiousness, and, my dear friends, it will not do to practice it in this case. The eyes of the whole world are turned in hope toward this country as exemplar and leader out of the dangers of war to the right of peace in this land of free man and free woman, where the urge of conquest does not exist, where lies the hope of mankind for future centuries to come. Life itself is energy, and how well we in America use its adjunct freedom, through which we have become, while less than 7 percent of the population of the world, the owners, users, and consumers of over half the wealth and other important things upon which the American standard of living depends and is based.

We are one-hundred-and-forty-million-odd souls, part of approximately 2,512,000,000, other souls, in this land of ours. During its over one and one-half centuries of life, our country has never had a famine. Elsewhere, everywhere else, the story of 6,000 years of history is different. In some lands, babes were even killed to prevent them from inevitable starvation. Are we, in this atomic age, more advanced in the civilized and productive use of our energies than any other nation, to fail in the heritage entrusted to us by the God in whom we trust. The challenge is unmistakable, and if this is in truth a government for the people, of the people, and by the people, surely we the people will see to it that our Government does its part in this international world crises of which the foot-and-mouth outbreak in Mexico is a very vital part.

The Late Honorable Orville Zimmerman

SPEECH OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 7, 1948

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK].

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, in the passing of our very dear friend and colleague, ORVILLE ZIMMERMAN, the House loses one of its ablest and most influential Members. ORVILLE ZIMMERMAN was one of the strong men of the House—quiet, dignified, one who seldom orated, but he was a Member who wielded a tremendous influence, not only in the higher councils of the House, but in the higher councils of his own party. ORVILLE ZIMMERMAN was truly a great American and too, a great Democrat. When a Democrat or a Republican is loyal to his party, we respect such a person because a loyal party man is akin to being a loyal American, I believe there is a direct relationship and the basic premise is loyalty.

As the former majority leader for the past 6 years I think I can speak somewhat with the voice of authority when I say that ORVILLE ZIMMERMAN wielded a powerful influence in the House, and in the higher councils of his own party.

Former Speaker RAYBURN and I looked to him for advice. We valued his advice. We recognized him as a sound thinker possessed of a penetrating and logical mind whose deductions were clear and definite. Whether he participated in party policy or in legislation concerning the welfare of our country, the contributions of ORVILLE ZIMMERMAN, were always extremely valuable. He was always quiet, dignified, and as I have said, very effective. His logical thinking always left its imprint.

As I speak, now, my mind goes back through the years to many occasions when I was with him, perhaps having lunch together as several speakers today have mentioned, and when in our conversations about this or that bill, or this or that problem, there may have been a difference of opinion, but I could always be certain that ORVILLE ZIMMERMAN would make a pertinent observation which would do much to help clarify any problem we discussed. His opinions made a marked impression on me, and he always was of invaluable assistance to me. Invariably I went to him when I sought the advice of Members of my own party and the House, and I have always had confidence in his judgment. I think it also might well be said that he died in the line of duty for he died in his office, where he put forth his best efforts so well for the people of his district, State, and Nation.

So he has left us, but he has left behind a memory. Yes; he has left behind

something more than a memory. He has left behind his contribution to this body during one of the most trying periods in the history of our Nation and the world. He was a great and capable Member of this House. His passing brings regret to all of us, not only because of his membership in this body but because of the personal friendship so many of us entertained for him.

To his wife and son I join with my other colleagues in extending to them my heartfelt sympathy. To the Members from the State of Missouri on both sides of the aisle, I join with my other colleagues from the other States of the Union in conveying to them our deep sympathy in the loss of one of their delegation whom they so dearly loved.

Selective Service Handled by Civilians

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JOHN W. GWYNNE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 8, 1948

Mr. GWYNNE of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, in view of the suggestions now being made for the revival of the selective-service program, the following editorial is very timely. I would recommend to all interested in this subject careful consideration of the following suggestion made by Mr. H. E. Taylor, editor of the Traer Star-Clipper, published in Traer, Iowa:

Indications are that Congress will authorize peacetime conscription of American youth again for the armed forces, because of the alarm felt over the present state of our relations with Russia. It is the view of the Army generals that voluntary enlistments cannot keep the services at even their present authorized strength, and that a draft, unpleasant as it will certainly be, is the only solution. The President, and the brass hats of the armed services, are also asking for compulsory military training. They say that the only alternative to a huge standing Army, which has always been repugnant to our country for reasons of principle as well as the huge cost, is a trained civilian reserve.

Until recently it appeared unlikely that the administration-sponsored bill for universal military training would be considered at all by Congress in an election year. The prospect that it would win the approval of Senators and Representatives having to run for reelection this year seemed impossible. But war hysteria in the National Capital in recent weeks has immensely accelerated congressional interest in national defense, and most anything seems possible now.

Volunteer enlistments have been disappointing for the reason that the services are having to compete for manpower with private industry, which is still short of help in many places in the country, and is continually raising wages to attract and hold skilled workers. If there was a scarcity of jobs in the country now instead of more jobs than takers, the armed services would have

DIGEST OF CONGRESSIONAL PROCEEDINGS

OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND FINANCE
Division of Legislative Reports
(For Department staff only)

Issued April 15, 1948
For actions of April 14, 1948
80th-2nd, No. 68

CONTENTS

Agricultural commodities.....19	Health.....45	Research, animal industry.....1
Appropriations.....7,9	Housing.....3,17,30,44	Roads.....35,43
Banking and currency.....25	Inflation.....33	Small business.....27,37,42
Decentralization.....5	Irrigation.....23	Social security.....46
Education.....38	Labor.....26,39,47	T.V.A.....36
Farm production.....16	Labor, farm.....21	Taxation.....31
Farm program.....32	Lands.....12	Territories and pos- sessions.....13
Federal aid.....35,38,43	Lands, reclamation.....2	Trade, foreign.....6,14,22
Flood control.....34	Livestock and meat.....1,41	Transportation, water.....24
Foreign affairs	Loans, farm.....3,10	Water pollution.....40
Relief.....7,11	Oleomargarine.....31	Water utilization.....18
Forests & forestry.....12,20,34	Prices, support.....19	Wildlife.....15
Grain.....8	Research.....3,4,28,30	

HIGHLIGHTS: Senate agreed to House amendment to foot-and-mouth disease research bill. Senate debated and laid aside bill to extend reclamation laws to Ark. Senate debated housing bill. Senate subcommittee approved Science Foundation bill. Rep. Hoge introduced price-support bill. House received ERP appropriation estimate. Rep. Hays urged allocation of grain to distillers and inserted Secretary Anderson's letter on this. House committee agreed to report bill to increase interest rate on farm-tenant loans.

SENATE

- 1. FOOT-AND-MOUTH DISEASE.** Concurred in the House amendment to S. 2038, authorizing research on this disease (p. 4500). This bill will now be sent to the President. This bill authorizes the Department to establish research laboratories, including acquisition of land, buildings, or facilities, and also the making of contracts, for research, in the U. S. or elsewhere, on foot-and-mouth disease and other animal diseases which constitute a threat to the U. S. livestock industry; prohibits introduction of live foot-mouth disease virus into the U. S. mainland except coastal islands separated therefrom by waters navigable for deep-water navigation and which shall not be connected with the mainland by any tunnel; permits, however, such introduction under safeguards if there is an outbreak in this country; authorizes employment of technical experts or scientists without regard to the Classification Act, not exceeding 5 and at pay not over \$15,000; authorizes appropriations, and also authorizes use of funds otherwise available for control or eradication of such diseases.
- 2. RECLAMATION.** Continued debate on S. 299, to extend the reclamation laws to Ark. (pp. 4503-6, 4510-16). Sen. Downey, Calif., indicated that he would move to recommit the bill, and mentioned that the views of the Agriculture Department had not been obtained. He indicated that, if the motion to recommit were defeated, he would discuss the bill fully and propose various amendments. Sen. Knowland, Calif. (as Acting Majority Leader) then moved to set aside the bill, let it take its place on the calendar, and proceed to consideration of the housing bill. Sen. Fulbright agreed. Thus the reclamation bill will not

automatically become the unfinished business at the end of the housing debate. (pp. 4517-8.)

3. HOUSING. Began debate on S. 866, the Taft-Ellender-Wagner housing bill (pp. 4518-31). The bill authorizes housing research through Housing and Home Finance Agency, with utilization of facilities of existing agencies. It also authorizes loans and grants for farm housing. However, the Banking and Currency Committee has recently reported amendments to the bill which would strike out the farm-housing provisions but direct the Housing and Home Finance Agency and USDA to study the subject and make recommendations to the next Congress.
4. SCIENCE FOUNDATION. A subcommittee of the Labor and Public Welfare Committee approved, for reporting to the full committee, with amendments, S. 2385, to create a National Science Foundation (p. D358).
5. DECENTRALIZATION. Sen. Wiley, Wis., spoke in favor of decentralization of Government agencies from D. C. as a national-defense measure (pp. 4500-1).
6. TRADE AGREEMENTS. Sen. Martin, Pa., inserted and discussed correspondence with the State Department on reciprocal trade agreements (pp. 4501-3).

HOUSE

7. FOREIGN AID APPROPRIATION. Received from the President a supplemental appropriation estimate of \$4,245,000,000 for expenses of the European recovery program, fiscal year 1948 (H.Doc. 610) (p. 4581).
8. GRAIN ALLOCATION. Rep. Hays, Ark., urged passage of legislation to authorize the allocation of grain to distillers and inserted Secretary Anderson's letter setting forth the present situation with regard to distillers' use of grain (pp. 4546-7).
9. MILITARY APPROPRIATIONS. Began debate on H.R. 6226, making supplemental appropriations for national defense for fiscal year 1948 (pp. 4559-66). The bill had been reported by the Appropriations Committee earlier in the day (H.Rept. 1729) (pp. 4534, 4581).
10. FARM LOANS. The "Daily Digest" states that the Agriculture Committee voted to report (but did not actually report) H.R. 6114, to amend Title I of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act so as to increase the interest rate of 1% to provide for redemption of nondelinquent insured mortgages, and to authorize advances for the preservation and protection of the insured loan security (p. D360).
11. FOREIGN AID. Received from the President a report of expenditures and activities under the U.S. foreign-relief program to war-devastated countries authorized by Public Law 84, 80th Cong. for the period Oct. 1 through Dec. 31, 1947 (H.Doc. 612) (p. 4541).
12. FOREST LANDS. The Public Lands Committee reported with amendments H.R. 3785, to authorize the State of Minnesota to condemn certain National Forest lands in Cass County, Minn., for fish propagation (H.Rept. 1730) (p. 4581).
13. ALASKAN STATEHOOD. The Public Lands Committee reported with amendments H.R. 5666, to provide for the admission of Alaska, the forty-ninth State (H.Rept. 1731) (p. 4581).
14. EXPORTS. The Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee submitted its report on

The message is as follows:

EXECUTIVE E, EIGHTIETH CONGRESS,
SECOND SESSION

To the Senate of the United States:

With a view to receiving the advice and consent of the Senate to ratification, I transmit herewith a treaty of friendship, commerce, and navigation between the United States of America and the Italian Republic, together with a protocol and an additional protocol relating thereto, signed at Rome on February 2, 1948.

The enclosed treaty, together with the two related protocols, was negotiated on a basis of complete equality between the two Governments. It is comprehensive and is designed to provide an effective basis for the future development of cultural, business, and trade relationships between the two countries. I consider that this treaty is an important manifestation of the friendly relations which exist between this country and post-Fascist Italy, and that it confirms the determination of the two Governments to apply in their economic and cultural intercourse the liberal principles that are fundamental to the democratic way of life. I commend it to the early consideration of the Senate.

I transmit also, for the information of the Senate, a copy of each of two notes, signed and exchanged on the same date, and a report on the treaty made to me by the Acting Secretary of State.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, April 14, 1948.

(Enclosures: (1) Report of the Acting Secretary of State; (2) treaty of friendship, commerce, and navigation, with protocol and additional protocol, signed at Rome February 2, 1948; (3) exchange of notes signed at Rome February 2, 1948.)

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. For the information of the Senate, the Chair will state that the Committee on Foreign Relations has already taken cognizance of the fact that the treaty was to be presented today. It has already taken under consideration the fact that a similar treaty with the Republic of China is now pending before the committee, and both will be taken up for immediate exploration and action.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting several nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

REPORT OF GOVERNOR OF PANAMA CANAL (H. DOC. NO. 613)

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, transmitting the Annual Report of the Governor of the Panama Canal, 1947, which, with the accompanying report, was referred to the Committee on Armed Services:

To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith, for the information of the Congress, the Annual Report

of the Governor of the Panama Canal, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1947.
HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, April 14, 1948.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIAL

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, and referred as indicated:

By the PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A resolution adopted by the mayor and Council of the Borough of Roselle, N. J., favoring the enactment of House bill 6012, to amend section 77 of the Bankruptcy Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A cablegram in the nature of a petition, from Dr. Francisco M. Susoni, Speaker of the House of Representatives of Puerto Rico, San Juan, P. R., praying for the enactment of legislation to repeal the limitation on exportation of refined sugar from Puerto Rico to the United States; to the Committee on Finance.

A letter in the nature of a memorial from Wesley K. Bender, of Freeport, N. Y., remonstrating against the enactment of House bill 5732, to prohibit unqualified individuals from receiving compensation for preparing or assisting in the preparation of income-tax returns; to the Committee on Finance.

ADDITIONAL REPORT OF SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE NATIONAL DEFENSE PROGRAM RELATING TO AIRCRAFT (PT. 3 OF REPT. NO. 440)

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, from the Special Committee To Investigate the National Defense Program, I ask unanimous consent to submit an additional report on aircraft. This report was approved by a majority of the subcommittee and a majority of the full committee, and was ordered filed with the Senate. The Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], chairman of the committee, took no part in the drafting or consideration of the subcommittee report or the report from the full committee.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the report will be received and printed.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I now ask unanimous consent that any member of the Special Committee Investigating the National Defense Program, if he so desires, may file minority views or a statement on or before April 30, 1948.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the order is made.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. HOLLAND (for himself and Mr. PEPPER):

S. 2496. A bill to provide for the conveyance to Pinellas County, State of Florida, of certain public lands herein described; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. DOWNEY:

S. 2497. A bill for the relief of Jozef Szajnfeld and family; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILEY (by request):

S. 2498. A bill for the relief of Ali Ipar; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TYDINGS:

S. 2499. A bill to provide for the development, administration, and maintenance of the Baltimore-Washington Parkway and the Suitland Parkway in the State of Maryland as extensions of the park system of the District of Columbia and its environs by the Secretary of the Interior, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado:

S. 2500. A bill to provide for expanded investigation and research at the experiment station at Golden, Colo.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 2501. A bill for the relief of King F. Trione and Dera Trione; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

THOMAS JEFFERSON ANNIVERSARY— ADDRESS BY SENATOR MORSE

[Mr. LANGER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by Senator MORSE at the celebration of the two hundred and fifth anniversary of the birth of Thomas Jefferson, at the Jefferson National Memorial, Washington, D. C., on April 13, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

GREEK CHILDREN AS IMMIGRANTS— ARTICLE BY SOTERIOS NICHOLSON

[Mr. CAPPER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Greek Children as Immigrants," written by Soterios Nicholson, of Washington, D. C., and published in the Washington Post of April 10, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

BRASS HATISM IN THE ARMY—ARTICLE BY DREW PEARSON

[Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Army Advised To Clean Out Brass Hatism," by Drew Pearson, from the Denver Post of April 6, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE COAL STRIKE—EDITORIAL FROM THE PROVIDENCE EVENING BULLETIN

[Mr. GREEN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Politics in Coal," published in the Providence Evening Bulletin, Tuesday, April 13, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

UNIVERSAL MILITARY TRAINING—ARTICLE FROM THE NEW YORK TIMES

[Mr. KILGORE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Is UMT Needed?—The Pros and Cons," by Howard C. Petersen, former Assistant Secretary of War, and Senator THOMAS of Utah, published in the New York Times of April 4, which appears in the Appendix.]

INVITATION TO MEMBERS OF THE SENATE TO VISIT EXHIBITION AT NATIONAL GALLERY OF ART

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I invite the attention of Senators to an invitation from the National Gallery of Art to view, this afternoon at 5:15, the works of art recovered in Germany during the war. The gallery is being kept open for the benefit of Senators, their wives, and principal secretaries.

As Senators know, large crowds have been in attendance since the exhibition opened, and it has been exceedingly difficult to see the pictures. I am informed that 67,000 persons went through the museum on Sunday. It has not been possible to see the pictures with any degree of comfort, so I requested that the museum make the exhibition available to Members of Congress. That will be done this afternoon from 5:15 to 7.

In that connection, a bill has been introduced concerning the pictures. The bill will be considered by the Armed Services Committee tomorrow, and I expect later by the Senate. So I hope every Senator who can do so will take advantage of the opportunity to see the pictures.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. I have seen the pictures, and I can tell my colleagues that they are well worth seeing.

SENATOR VANDENBERG'S ADVICE TO STALIN

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, a very fine statement has been made by the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] with regard to the stand taken by Mr. Stalin with respect to the policies approved by the United States. I ask that the Senator's remarks, as recently published by Magazine Digest, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LISTEN, MR. STALIN

(By Senator ARTHUR VANDENBERG)

(Now that the United States has announced its backing of the union of western Europe, we are at last committed to leadership of the countries still outside the Soviet sphere. What can the world expect from this leadership, particularly as it applies to our relations with Russia? The best statement of America's aims, we believe, is that given by Senator ARTHUR VANDENBERG. As head of the decisive Senate Foreign Relations Committee, VANDENBERG is the man who determines congressional approval of our foreign policy. His advice to Stalin, therefore, is the voice of America.)

First, you should understand, with complete conviction, that we deeply respect the great Russian people and their inalienable right to rule themselves to suit themselves, precisely as we insist on this right for ourselves and others.

Second, you should understand, with complete conviction, that we are just as determined as you are that military aggression from any source, and no matter what its guise, shall never curse the earth again, and we are enlisted in this cause for keeps.

Third, you should understand, with complete conviction, that we are prepared for enlightened, progressive cooperation with every land which invites and deserves our mutual good will.

Fourth, you should understand, with equally complete conviction, that we cannot be driven, coerced, or pressured into positions which we decline voluntarily to assume; and that we will not bargain in human rights and fundamental liberties anywhere on earth.

PRINTING OF ADDITIONAL COPIES OF REPORT ENTITLED "THE STRATEGY AND TACTICS OF WORLD COMMUNISM"

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate House Concurrent Resolution 154, which was read, as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That there be printed as a House document, and that there be printed 15,000 additional copies each of the report and supplements 1 and 2 of the Subcommittee on National and International Movements of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, entitled "The Strategy and Tactics of World Communism" for the use of the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Mr. JENNER. I move that the Senate agree to the concurrent resolution.

The motion was agreed to.

FOOT-AND-MOUTH DISEASE RESEARCH

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the amendment of the

House of Representatives to the bill from the Senate (S. 2038) to enable the Secretary of Agriculture to conduct research on foot-and-mouth disease and other diseases of animals and to amend the act of May 29, 1884 (23 Stat. 31), as amended, by adding another section, which was to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That the act of May 29, 1884 (23 Stat. 31), as amended, is hereby amended by adding a new section 12 reading as follows:

"SEC. 12. The Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to establish research laboratories, including the acquisition of necessary land, buildings, or facilities, and also the making of research contracts under the authority contained in section 10 (a) of the Bankhead-Jones Act of 1935, as amended by the Research and Marketing Act of 1946, for research and study, in the United States or elsewhere, of foot-and-mouth disease and other animal diseases which in the opinion of the Secretary constitute a threat to the livestock industry of the United States: *Provided*, That no live virus of foot-and-mouth disease may be introduced for any purpose into any part of the mainland of the United States except coastal islands separated therefrom by waters navigable for deep-water navigation and which shall not be connected with the mainland by any tunnel, and except further, that in the event of outbreak of foot-and-mouth disease in this country, the Secretary of Agriculture may, at his discretion, permit said virus to be brought into the United States under adequate safeguards. To carry out the provisions of this section, the Secretary is authorized to employ technical experts or scientists without regard to the Classification Act: *Provided*, That the number so employed shall not exceed five and that the maximum compensation for each shall not exceed \$15,000 per annum. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as Congress may deem necessary; in addition, the Secretary is authorized to utilize, in carrying out this section, funds otherwise available for the control or eradication of such diseases."

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I move that the Senate concur in the amendment of the House.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I wonder if the Senator would indicate what change the House made in the Senate bill.

Mr. THYE. Primarily the research laboratory will have to be located out in the open. It cannot be on any peninsula or any lands adjacent so that there would be any danger of fire.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I understand the House has strengthened the amendment which the junior Senator from California submitted, and which the Senator from Minnesota accepted in the Senate, and that it has been strengthened even beyond that. Is that correct?

Mr. THYE. The junior Senator from California is correct. It has been strengthened.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Minnesota.

The motion was agreed to.

DECENTRALIZATION AND RECENTRALIZATION OF GOVERNMENT AGENCIES

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, for a number of years I have been seeking to stimulate decentralization of government, of industry, and of population. My efforts began quite a while before atomic energy was discovered. Atomic

energy has precipitated this matter to the fore, as I see it, in a rather dramatic way. If the bomb which fell on Hiroshima had fallen on Tokyo, it would have decidedly decentralized the political establishment of Japan; it would have put out of business the legislative branch, the executive branch, and all other branches.

Mr. President, recently I inquired of the Bureau of the Budget as to experiences and costs of recentralization of agencies to Washington, D. C. Governmental agencies have been returning to Washington instead of leaving Washington.

I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD, following my remarks, the text of the Bureau's letter to me, prefaced by a statement which I released on the subject of the Bureau's communication. I intend to continue my fight to secure decentralization, particularly of Government agencies from Washington. What I should like to have, Mr. President, is a committee especially delegated, consisting of Members of both Houses, who would take the subject in hand and study it, in view of the present aspect of affairs in the world today. We cannot close our eyes to what would happen if war should come. Airplanes equipped with bombs could put out of commission cities such as New York, and if they should put out of commission the oil-producing centers of this country the effect would be that we would be practically out of business so far as farming is concerned, because what we are actually doing is mechanizing our farms and dispensing with horses on the farms. That is another angle of the complete study which I have in mind.

So, Mr. President, I ask that the statement and letter to which I have referred be printed in the RECORD following my remarks.

There being no objection, the statement and letter were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY HON. ALEXANDER WILEY, UNITED STATES SENATOR FROM WISCONSIN, APRIL 11, 1948

There is reprinted below the text of a letter which I have just received from the United States Bureau of the Budget regarding the cost of recentralizing those Government agencies which have been brought back to Washington, about which I had inquired. I was particularly interested in the comments made by the Bureau's Acting Director to the effect that the President is keenly aware of the problems brought about by overcentralization in Washington, particularly, in the event of offensive warfare against our country. The Acting Director, however, went on to say that he does not regard it "within the jurisdiction of the Bureau of the Budget to take active leadership" in planning decentralization.

On March 19, Secretary of the Air Force Symington wrote to me that while the military aspects of decentralization have been separated into various segments by the Joint Chiefs of Staff for study by the military arms, he felt that "Congress is the proper agency to resolve the problem of dispersion of Government facilities in Washington, based upon recommendations made by the President." The big question is: When, if ever, will such recommendations be forthcoming? Moreover, how can the President make these recommendations, if his own

[PUBLIC LAW 496—80TH CONGRESS]

[CHAPTER 229—2D SESSION]

[S. 2038]

AN ACT

To enable the Secretary of Agriculture to conduct research on foot-and-mouth disease and other diseases of animals and to amend the Act of May 29, 1884 (23 Stat. 31), as amended, by adding another section.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Act of May 29, 1884 (23 Stat. 31), as amended, is hereby amended by adding a new section 12 reading as follows:

“SEC. 12. The Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to establish research laboratories, including the acquisition of necessary land, buildings, or facilities, and also the making of research contracts under the authority contained in section 10 (a) of the Bankhead-Jones Act of 1935, as amended by the Research and Marketing Act of 1946, for research and study, in the United States or elsewhere, of foot-and-mouth disease and other animal diseases which in the opinion of the Secretary constitute a threat to the livestock industry of the United States: *Provided*, That no live virus of foot-and-mouth disease may be introduced for any purpose into any part of the mainland of the United States except coastal islands separated therefrom by waters navigable for deep-water navigation and which shall not be connected with the mainland by any tunnel, and except further, that in the event of outbreak of foot-and-mouth disease in this country, the Secretary of Agriculture may, at his discretion, permit said virus to be brought into the United States under adequate safeguards. To carry out the provisions of this section, the Secretary is authorized to employ technical experts or scientists without regard to the Classification Act: *Provided*, That the number so employed shall not exceed five and that the maximum compensation for each shall not exceed \$15,000 per annum. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as Congress may deem necessary; in addition, the Secretary is authorized to utilize, in carrying out this section, funds otherwise available for the control or eradication of such diseases.”

Approved April 24, 1948.

